

THE POPE AND TEMPORAL POWER

BY
THEODORE GRAEBNER

AUTHOR OF "THE DARK AGES," ETC.



NORTHWESTERN PUBLISHING HOUSE
MILWAUKEE, WIS.
1929

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introduction	5
1. Infallibility Speaks to the State.....	11
2. The Interpretation of the Doctors.....	23
3. World-Wide Aggression.....	48
4. The Pope and the World War.....	57
5. The Three Pillars.....	89
6. The American Battalions.....	106
7. Some Forgotten Chapters of Our History.....	115
8. The Pope and the Presidency.....	128
9. Temporal Power at Last!.....	145

INTRODUCTION.

When the pope lost the city of Rome and its environs, in 1870, the Unity of Italy, thus restored, was celebrated at a great public meeting held at the Academy of Music in New York City, January 12, 1871. The call for the meeting was signed by the following: William E. Dodge, Morris K. Jesup, Cyrus W. Field, Bishop E. S. Jaynes, Henry C. Potter, Samuel F. B. Morse, Henry Clews, R. Ogden Doremus, Levi P. Morton, Phelps, Dodge & Co., and a long list of other distinguished men.

The New York *Times*, commenting upon the call for this recognition of Italian nationality, said: "That the old priestly monarchy, dating almost from Charlemagne, which had sown its harvest of wrongs and oppressions for centuries, which had once founded its throne over all earthly monarchies, and under religious names had scattered curses among mankind, whose fall had been the object of prayer and the subject of prophecy, should at length, after a thousand years and more of misrule, be overthrown by its own subjects, and be succeeded by a kingdom in harmony with the ideas of the age, was something that no liberal American could hear of without the deepest feeling of approval."

The vast audience which completely filled the Academy of Music, was addressed by men of prominence in the political life of the nation. The catalog of those who spoke or who sent written greetings almost reads like a roster of the famous Americans of the day. There was the Vice-President of the United States, Schuyler Colfax, Senators Chas. Sumner, James A. Garfield, later

president, Wm. L. Garrison, Horace Bushnell, John G. Whittier, Oliver W. Holmes, J. G. Holland, William D. Howells, Henry James, Geo. W. Curtis, E. E. Hale, — to mention only a few.

The speakers were not squeamish about the lessons which the pope in their opinion was to derive from his loss of temporal power. Indeed, many of the speakers celebrated not so much the rise of a United Italy, as the downfall of the papacy. "Rome," said Parke Godwin, "has resisted every forward and upward movement. She has smitten it when she could openly; she has stabbed it when she could not smite, but thank God, she has not killed it, for now, after centuries of trial, and despite her machinations and intrigues, comes the completed triumph." Henry James, even more cuttingly said: "Nothing, on the whole, can be so unbecoming to the claimant of a Divine right, and so utterly fatal to his respect among sensible men, as idly to shriek over the inevitable, or to spend his days in feebly blaspheming the benignant Providence by whose irresistible might all proud things are being so rapidly abased and all humble things exalted."

Professor Frederick H. Hedge of Harvard University wrote: "On July 13, 1870, the dogma of Papal infallibility was proclaimed, and on the 15th a war began, which, by taking from Rome the support of French bayonets, permitted the entrance of the Italian patriots and consummated the Papal catastrophe. Within two months of the time of his assuming the prerogative of God, the deluded old man, like another Nebuchadnezzar, was deprived of his throne."

To-day, almost sixty years after its disappearance from the roster of temporal governments, the papacy again claims sovereignty over a portion of Italian soil. On February 11, 1929, the Treaty and Concordat

were signed by Premier Mussolini and Cardinal Gasparri, and Pope Pius XI now rules over the Citta di Vaticano. The significance of this restoration of the Pope's temporal power can be fully understood only in the light of events still in the future. Possibly even this statement should be modified. Whatever the political consequences, no man can understand the meaning of the Roman Pontiff's desire for temporal power, unless he takes into consideration the policy of aggression which has actuated the popes and their advisors within the memory of living men. It is only as part of a world-embracing scheme, that the Pope's decision to step out of his retirement as Prisoner of the Vatican can be understood.

And even this does not suffice. In the present volume I have gathered evidence, sufficient, I believe, to convince all but a blind partisan, of the Pope's hunger for domination over the property, the bodies, and the very souls of every living human being. I have traced this desire for dominion to the principles announced in official utterances of the Popes and to the testimony of his authorized interpreters in many lands, including our own. But even such evidence will not convey to every reader, even to fair-minded readers in every instance, a true comprehension of the papal machinations. These can be understood only, ONLY, I say, by an evangelical Christian.

The papacy is a spiritual power, "spiritual" in the most sinister sense of which that word is capable. Its essence is anti-Christian. It can be clearly perceived only in the light of the Gospel. Because Luther saw the true inwardness of Romanism, — ever since, as a young professor, he wrote to a friend: "I believe in very truth that the Pope is Anti-Christ," — his Reformatory work

was able to set men free also from the political oppression which held the nations in thrall to the Roman Bishop.

The Roman Church has not reformed. It is to-day what it always was. It hardened its heart, when a few years after Luther's death it officially pronounced a curse upon the central doctrine of Christianity — Justification by Faith Alone. He who is able to grasp, by the Illumination which comes from God's Spirit, this doctrine of Justification, is able to grasp the meaning of the Pope's program of secular aggression. A thorough study of The Smalcald Articles is the best complement to the study of any phase of Roman activity in the political domain. Only those who acknowledge the Scripturalness of the judgment passed on the papacy in that tremendous document are able to penetrate the various disguises of the Mystery of Iniquity, and are able fully to evaluate also the data which have gone into the composition of this treatise.

The aid of Professor R. W. Heintze of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, and of Professor A. Pieper of the Theological Seminary at Wauwatosa, Wis., who have carefully revised the manuscript, is gratefully acknowledged by the author.

Th. G.

Infallibility Speaks to the State.

1. Infallibility Speaks to the State.

In the Public Library of any of our greater American cities, you will find the volume entitled *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII*. It is published by Benziger Bros., Barclay Street, New York, "Official Printers to the Holy Apostolic See." It bears the words *Nihil Obstat* ("no objections") of Remigius Lafort, official censor of books, and the *imprimatur* (leave to print) of the late Cardinal Farley. In this book of authentic and official papal letters, Leo XIII writes on page 148, in concluding an argument: "*Hence follows the fatal theory of the separation of church and state. But the absurdity of such a position is manifest.*" On page 323 Pope Leo says: "*It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the most desirable status of the church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for state and church to be, as in America, dis-severed and divorced.*"

So we find our American Constitution in conflict with the Vatican on the question of separation of church and state.

There cannot be, in America, more than one political allegiance. You cannot be a loyal American, and yet give supreme civil and temporal allegiance to another power. Yet the pope claims our supreme political allegiance as Christians. If you will look in the Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII for 1879, you will find the following:

"The church of Rome is one monarchy over all the kingdoms of the world, as the mind and soul of the body

of a man, or as god in the world. Therefore the church of Rome must not only have the spiritual power, but the supreme temporal power."

The Encyclical of Leo XIII, entitled *Immortale Dei*, and dated November 1st, 1885 (page 114), says:

*"And assuredly all ought to hold that it was not without a singular disposition of God's providence that this power of the church was provided with a civil sovereignty as the surest safeguard of her independence." Page 116: "In political affairs, and all matters civil, the laws * * * are not framed according to the delusive caprices and opinions of the masses of the people * * * the ruling powers are invested with a sacredness more than human * * * and the obedience of the citizen is rendered with a feeling of honor and dignity, since obedience is not the servitude of man to man, but submission to the will of God, exercising his sovereignty through the medium of men" (that is to say, the Popes of Rome).*

Page 120: *"From this source as from a fountain head burst forth all those latter tenets of unbridled license. * * * Among these principles the main one lays down, that as all men are alike by race and nature, so in like manner all are equal in the control of their life; that each one is his own master so far as to be in no sense under the control of any other individual; that each is free to think on every subject just as he may choose, and to do whatever he may like to do; that no man has any right to rule over other men. In a society grounded upon such maxims, all government is nothing more nor less than the will of the people, and the people being under the power of itself alone, is alone its own ruler. Thus, as is evident, a state becomes nothing but a multitude (or mob) which is its own master and ruler. And since the populace is declared to contain within itself the springhead of all rights*

and of all power, it follows that the state does not consider itself bound by any kind of duty towards God" (the pope being God's sole representative in the nation).

"Moreover, it (the state) believes that it is not obliged to make public profession of any religion; or to enquire which of the very many religions is the only true one; or to prefer one religion to all the rest; or to show to any form of religion any favor; but, on the contrary, is bound to grant equal rights to every creed. And it is a part of this theory that all questions that concern religion are to be referred to private judgment; that every one is to be free to follow whatever religion he prefers, or none at all if he disapprove of all.

*"From this the following consequences logically flow: that the judgment of each one's conscience is independent of all [papal] law; that the most unrestrained opinions may openly be expressed as to the practice or omission of divine [papal] worship; and that every one has unbounded license to think whatever he chooses and to publish abroad whatever he thinks. Now when the state rests on foundations like those just named * * * they who administer the civil power lay down the law at their own will, and in matters that appertain to religion defiantly put aside the most sacred decrees of the church * * * Lastly, they treat the church with such arrogance that, rejecting entirely her title to the nature and rights of a perfect society, they hold that she differs in no respect from other societies [Protestant] in the state, and for this reason possesses no right nor any legal power of action, save that which she holds by the concession and favor of the government."*

Page 124: *"The State is acting against the laws and dictates of nature whenever it permits the license (liberty) of opinion and action * * * to exclude the*

church, founded by God Himself, from the business of life, from the power of making laws, from the training of youth, from domestic society, is a grave and fatal error."

Page 125: "Doctrines such as these * * * most seriously affect the whole civil order * * * Thus Gregory the XVI., in his Encyclical Letter *Mirari vos*, of date August 15, 1832, inveighed with weighty words against the sophism * * * that it is right for individuals to form their own judgments about religion; that each man's conscience is his sole and all-sufficing guide; and that it is lawful for every man to publish his own views, whatever they may be. * * * " On the question of the separation of church and state the same pontiff writes as follows: "Nor can we hope for happier results either for religion or for the civil government from the wishes of those who desire that the church be separated from the state."

Page 126. Prop. XXXIX of the Syllabus of Pius X: "(It is an error to say) The state as the origin and source of all rights enjoys a right that is unlimited."

Prop. LV: "(It is an error to say) The church must be separated from the state, and the state from the church."

Pius X in his Encyclical Letter *Jamdudum*, May 24, 1911, condemned the law separating church and state in the following language:

"Wherefore as a sense of our apostolic duty prompts, in view of this insolence and audacity of the enemies of God, that we should vigilantly guard the dignity and honor of religion and preserve the rights of the Holy Catholic church, we of our apostolic authority reprobate, condemn, and reject the law separating church and state in Portugal, which makes no account of God, and repudiates the Catholic creed."

In an address to the Literary Society of Rome, Pope Pius IX, on July 20, 1870, claimed the right in view of

his authority as Pope to depose kings and to absolve nations from their oath of allegiance to their rulers. (Dallmann, *Church and State*). Pius X teaches the same doctrine in his Encyclical of October 4, 1903, and in his Allocution of November 9, 1903. (Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, pp. 105-108.)

On August 15, 1832, in his Encyclical *Mirari Vos*, Pope Gregory XVI expressly condemned in very strong language the "arrogance" of those who advocate a separation of church and state. Pope Leo XIII in several official documents severely arraigns those governments which fail to support the Roman church and refuse it a share in the administration of affairs. In an Encyclical letter dated July 20, 1888, he expressly denies that nations have the right to proclaim universal freedom of worship, and imposes the duty upon all governments of the world to confess allegiance to the religion of Rome. He refers to the separation of church and state as a "pernicious doctrine."

The third Schema of the Vatican Council of 1870, "On the Church and the Pope," may be thus summed up: "The Christian world consists simply of masters and slaves; the masters are the Italians, the Pope, and his Court, and the slaves are all bishops (including the Italians themselves), all priests, and all the laity. * * * Church and State are immutably connected, but in the sense that the Church's laws always hold good before and against the civil law; and therefore every Papal ordinance that is opposed to the Constitution and law of the land binds the faithful, under mortal sin, to disobedience to the Constitution and law of their country." (*Quirinus*, [Lord Acton], pp. 203.204. Lord Acton was at Rome during the Vatican Council and reported the proceedings.)

Leo XIII in his Encyclical Letter *Sapientiae Christianae* of January 10, 1890, has given the decree instructing the faithful to take their religion into politics, in the following words:

*"The political prudence of private individuals would seem to consist wholly in carrying out faithfully the orders issued by lawful authority. * * * It is his (the Pope's) charge not only to rule the church, but generally so to regulate the actions of Christian citizens that these may be in apt conformity to their hope of gaining eternal salvation."* (l. c., p. 45.)

"Where the church does not forbid taking part in public affairs it is fit and proper to give support to men of acknowledged worth, and who pledge themselves to deserve well in the Catholic cause." (Ed. Herder, p. 39.)

Is not this an order to take religion into politics? And coming from the Supreme Pontiff every good Catholic must obey the order or, he is told, endanger his eternal salvation.

Page 130: *"It is also of great moment to the public to take a prudent part in the business of municipal administration, and to endeavor above all to introduce effectual measures * * * so that * * * public provision may be made for the instruction of youth in religion."*

Page 131: *"Catholics should * * * give their attention to national politics * * * Catholics have just reasons for taking part in the conduct of public affairs."*

Page 132: *"First and foremost, it is the duty of all Catholics worthy of the name * * * to make use of popular institutions, for the advancement of truth" (as taught by Rome); "to endeavor to bring back all civil society to the pattern and form of Christianity which we have described * * * Both these objects will be carried into effect with-*

out fail if all will follow the guidance of the Apostolic See as their rule of life, and obey the bishops."

Throughout the whole modern epoch and down to to-day, the claim of the papacy to authority has suffered not the smallest change, as may be studied conveniently in the well-known Encyclical of Pius IX of December 8, 1864. This Encyclical Letter was intended to extinguish a very powerful movement among the liberal Catholics of the European continent, which shook the Vatican in the middle of the nineteenth century; and no historic document was ever more clear and precise. Those Catholics among us who desire to be good Americans should study this Encyclical which is to-day the absolute expression of the Roman creed. They should study it, before they blame the Protestants for thinking that the Catholic faith conflicts with democracy.

In the course of a long prelude to the condemnation of certain new doctrines, Pope Pius IX says that men must not imagine that the authority of the Roman Church extends only to matters of faith and morals, as certain liberals had contended. His words are as follows:

"Neither can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, assert that the judgments and decrees of the Holy See, the object of which is declared to concern the general welfare of the Church, its rights and its discipline, do not claim acquiescence and obedience, under pain of sin and loss of the Catholic profession, if they do not treat of dogmas of faith and morals.

"How contrary is this doctrine to the Catholic dogma of plenary power, divinely conferred on the Sovereign Pontiff by our Lord Jesus Christ, to guide, to supervise and govern the Universal Church, no one can fail to see and understand clearly and evidently.

"Amid so great perversity of depraved opinions, We, remembering our Apostolic duty and solicitous before all things for our most holy religion, for sound doctrine, for the salvation of the souls confided to Us, and for the welfare of human society itself, have considered the moment opportune to raise anew Our Apostolic Voice."

In this great Encyclical the Church's condemnation is pronounced upon all those who will not acknowledge the pope's authority to lay his commands upon States, in such a way that not only family life, the school, and education pass entirely under the control of the Roman Church, but that the pope may even interfere in all legislation and require its alteration.* The Encyclical pronounces one general condemnation upon certain propositions which are enumerated in a separate document called the *Syllabus*. The *Syllabus* is an addendum. In it each condemned proposition is numbered, and there are eighty of them. They express the liberal claims, which are condemned as a group by the Encyclical. For example, Number 15 reads as follows: "It is permitted to each man to adopt and profess the religion which he believes to be true, according to the light of reason." This is one *claim* which the Pope denies in the Encyclical.

In order to quote one of the condemned propositions separately, it is customary, and indeed necessary, to apply the general negative (from the Encyclical) to the particular clause quoted (from the *Syllabus*). Thus Number 15 will read: "It is *not* permitted for each man to adopt and profess the religion he believes to be true according to the light of reason." In like manner any proposition that is *denied* in the *Syllabus* must be *asserted*

* *History of the Papacy in the XIX Century*, by Dr. Fredrik Nielson, Vol. II, 260. (Dutton, 1906) *La Grande Encyclopedie*, Titles, Pie IX and *Syllabus*.

in quoting the clause separately. (As in propositions 20 and 24 cited below.)

I will cite a few of the propositions from the *Syllabus*, enough of them to show that the Roman Church condemns every political, social, and educational idea that a patriotic American holds sacred.

Number 20. The Ecclesiastical power must exercise its authority without the permission or assent of the civil power.

Number 24. It has the right to employ force.

Number 55. The Church ought not to be separated from the State nor the State from the Church.

Number 57. The science of things philosophical and moral, as well as the civil laws, neither can nor ought to be free from divine ecclesiastical authority.

By separating the explanatory part from the propositions which he wishes to condemn, the Pope adopted a method that leaves no room for misunderstanding, qualification, or the mixing up of one proposition with another, so common in Catholic utterances, and showed how much in earnest he was.

We claim to have proved from these dogmatic utterances of the Popes the following:

First — That a "good" Roman Catholic, that is one who keeps his obligation to the Pope, cannot consistently be a loyal American citizen.

1. Because the Pope denounces our form of government. 2. Because he claims full sovereignty not only over Catholics but over all Christians. 3. Because the first allegiance of Catholics is to him as a king of kings and as exercising a sovereignty superior to our constitution and government. 4. Because he instructs them to use the franchise which they hold and which they have

acquired by means of a secondary and inferior obligation to our government and its institutions. 5. We claim that it has been proved, that every good Roman Catholic who has become a citizen in the United States, when he took the oath of citizenship, having thereby abrogated his allegiance to every prince and potentate and who still acknowledges the supremacy over all governments of the Pope as a pontiff or potentate, is as such serving a foreign potentate and is under obligation to bring the government and the institutions under the sovereignty of such potentate.

Second — We claim that, by the foregoing decretals of the Popes and the prelates of the church we have proved that the pope is directing those whom he styles the Faithful in the arena of American politics. 1. That he has advised the Roman Catholics in this republic to use their political power in causing the constitution and laws to be brought into conformity to his teachings as the assumed supreme sovereign over all civil government. 2. That the church teaches that a Roman Catholic in order to keep his obligation must vote as a Catholic and not as an American citizen.

In particular, the Roman Catholic bishops are under obligation to bring every state into subjection to the Pope as temporal ruler. According to the law of the Roman obedience every bishop at his consecration is required to take an oath of allegiance to the pope. It is no secret, and anyone who so desires can read it in the Latin original in the *Pontificale Romanum*. We are particularly interested in one clause. The bishop promises under oath the following: "Heretics, schismatics and rebels against our aforementioned lord (the pope) or his successors I will prosecute and assail (*persequar et impugnabo*) according to my ability."

We, evangelical Christians, are the heretics and the rebels against the pope. For the pope claims jurisdiction over us if we are Christians. This is the way that claim is stated in the Canon Law (Can. 218, § 1): "The Roman Pontiff, the successor of the Blessed Peter in the primacy, has not only the primacy of honor, but the supreme and unrestricted power of jurisdiction in the Universal Church, both in matters which pertain to faith and morals, and also to those which pertain to the discipline and conduct of the Church spread over the whole earth." That includes us, for the pope has expressly said so in the famous letter written by Pius IX to Emperor William I, on the seventh of August, 1873, where he says, "Everyone who has received baptism belongs in some form or manner (what that is, it is not necessary to explain at this place) belongs, I say, to the pope." This is no new claim, nor one that has been since surrendered, but it is the unfaltering claim of the papacy. So we are not only heretics but also rebels against the pope. In either case every Roman bishop is sworn to carry on a warfare against us.

The bishop swears to carry out the wishes of the Pope; what are they as related to us and our American government? We have the answer in the extracts, already quoted, from the *Syllabus* of Errors, which Pius IX issued with the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* on December 8, 1864, and which Roman dogmatic writers class with the three or four papal utterances that bear the marks of papal infallibility.

**The Interpretation of the
Doctors.**

2. The Interpretation of the Doctors.

Dr. Harry E. Woolever, editor and director of the *National Methodist Press*, in 1927 addressed a public mass meeting in Washington, on "The Mexican Crisis from the American Protestant Viewpoint." He quoted from a book bearing the official sanction of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and used by the National Catholic Welfare Council, to show that the Roman Catholic Church teaches the doctrine of its right over secular institutions, and gave striking examples of attempts to enforce this declared right on the Federal Government at Washington. He said in part:

"The ecclesiastical positions of the American Protestant churches and the Roman Catholic Church have an entirely different viewpoint as to their relationship to governments. It is here that unrest between the Romanists and the American churchmen has centered and the sooner it is cleared up the better for all concerned. The Protestant churches in the United States do not believe that any church as an ecclesiastical organization has any right to impose its will upon government officials or to dictate to any voter as to how he shall cast his ballot.

"The Roman Catholic Church, on the contrary, believes itself above the government and empowered to dictate to rulers. It has exercised this power wherever it became strong enough to make and unmake rulers. History bears unquestionable facts of this activity.

"It is the opinion of many Protestants that the Roman Church doctrine which teaches its right to interfere directly in the affairs of the nations is an ancient practice now relegated to the past. This is not the fact. I will quote you some statements made in a recent book and bearing the official sanction of the Roman Catholic hierarchy of the United States. This book is entitled "The State and the Church," by Dr. John A. Ryan, professor of Moral Theology at the Catholic University of America, and

24 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

Moorhouse F. X. Millar, of the Jesuit Society. The issue from which I am quoting was printed in 1924, and copyrighted by the National Catholic Welfare Council.

"On page 16, I find these words: 'To exclude the Church, founded by God Himself, from the business of life, from the power of making laws, from the training of youth, from domestic society, is a grave and fatal error.'

"On page 32, we read: 'But Pope Leo goes further. He declares that the State must not only "have care for religion," but recognize the true religion. This means the form of religion professed by the Catholic Church. It is a thoroughly logical position. If the State is under moral compulsion to profess and promote religion, it is obviously obliged to profess and promote only the religion that is true; for no individual, no group of individuals, no society, no State is justified in supporting error or in according to error the same recognition as to truth.'

"On page 38 are these words: 'If religious freedom has been accepted and sworn to as a fundamental law in a constitution, the obligation to show this tolerance is binding in conscience. "The principle of tolerance," he (Father Pohle) continues, "cannot be disregarded even by Catholic States without violation of oath and loyalty, and without violent internal convulsions."

"'But constitutions can be changed, and non-Catholic sects may decline to such a point that the political *proscription* of them may become feasible and expedient. What protection would they then have against a Catholic State? The latter could logically tolerate only such religious activities as were confined to the members of the dissenting group. It could not permit them to carry on general propaganda nor accord their organization certain privileges that had formerly been extended to all religious corporations.'

"'Religious freedom' does not exist in any state wholly Roman Catholic; only when Roman Catholicism has been overthrown have governments set up constitutions providing 'religious freedom.' And then, Rome sweetly and watchfully abides the time when the 'non-Catholic sects may decline to such a point that the political *proscription* of them may become feasible and expedient.' How significant this word 'proscription'!

In commenting on the force and effect of such teaching the speaker stated:

"We believe that such a doctrine is as harmful to the State as is the radical view of the communists. We take on the other hand those words of Washington in which he said: 'The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, 'till changed by the explicit and authentic act of the whole people is sacredly obligatory on all. The very idea of the power and the right of the People to establish Government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established Government.'

"The Roman Catholic position is that the State has no right to make laws that in any way involve moral aspects. Then the above quoted book goes on to say on page 42: 'It is true that the actions of the State, whether in the field of legislation or administration, have moral aspects, inasmuch as they are human actions; therefore, they are in some manner subject to the Church as the interpreter of the moral law. * * *

'Whether a particular act of the State is contrary to the moral law, is a question which obviously must be decided by some authority or tribunal other than the State itself, since the State has no competence in the field of morals.'

The question is: If the Roman hierarchy can assume civic functions by the fiat of *moral* and *spiritual* right, where — in human affairs — are its limitations, and in a Catholic State who may dare, without martyrdom, question even its most arrant assumptions? What have been the results wherever the Roman hierarchy has exercised its supremacy in human affairs? Scan the pages of Mediaeval Europe and then to-day confer with the liberal minds of Poland, Spain, Portugal and other European countries under the domination of Rome; and having done this come to our own hemisphere and ask every sad-thinking soul of South America, Central America and Mexico something of the conditions in his "Catholic State." When you have received their answers you will ask yourself a few relevant questions. The first that will come to your mind is: Can it be possible that the Roman

26 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

Catholic Church, under the auspices of the National Catholic Welfare Council and in the Capital at Washington, is to-day, in this 20th century, spreading the doctrines here quoted?

Catholic Belief, printed and published by Benziger Brothers, printers to the Holy Apostolic See, has the *Imprimatur*, (June 5, 1884) of John Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York. On the Sovereignty of the Pope it has this, page 253:

"I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman church for the mother and mistress of all churches, and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

"I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things which the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly the Holy Council of Trent and the Oecumenical Vatican Council, have delivered, defined and declared, and in particular, about the supremacy and infallible teachings of the Roman pontiff."

Ferraris' *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, issued from Rome, 1899, gives the following definition of the pope's powers:

"The Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven and of earth and of the lower regions * * * The Pope is as it were God on earth, sole sovereign of the faithful of Christ, chief king of kings, having plenitude of power, to whom has been trusted by the omnipotent God not only direction of the earthly but also of the heavenly kingdom."

"The Pope has the right to give countries and nations which are non-Catholic to Catholic regents, who can reduce them to slavery. — The Pope has the right to annul state laws, traditions, constitutions; and to absolve from obedience thereto, as soon as they seem detrimental to the rights of the Church, or those of the clergy." (*Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts von Gratian bis auf Papst Gregor IX.* Stuttgart, 1875-80. 3 vols. Quoted by Dallmann from *Words of Help*, Am. Tract Society, p. 258.)

"All papal measures, as regards their truth, belong to the order of faith, or morals, or law. All decrees, whatever their subject, always contain a true doctrine, whether speculative,

moral, or juridical. But the Pope is infallible in the order of truth and doctrine, and therefore in all his decrees." (*Quirinus*, p. 124.)

Note the statement about the "order of morals." We shall revert to the subject.

Francis Suarez, the greatest Jesuit theologian, says: "The papal power over kings includes the power to depose them. This is as certain as that the Church cannot err in matters of faith and morals." (Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, p. 68.) The Jesuit commentator Cathrein calls attention to the similarity between the *Unam Sanctam* of Pope Boniface VIII and the *Immortale Dei* of November 1, 1885, of Pope Leo XIII. (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, p. 36.) The power claimed in an earlier day is claimed to-day; formerly they called it the "direct" power, now they call it the "indirect" power. "It is another name; but what's in a name? The thing is the same," says William Dallmann.

Cardinal Gibbons wrote in 1909 (*North American Review*): "A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing the form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God." In writing this, the cardinal acted on Talleyrand's definition of language: "Language is a means of concealing one's thoughts." The sentence is a masterpiece of Jesuitism. Does it not read as though the cardinal stands square upon the American constitution in regard to the question of freedom of worship? But note that one word: "right." Dictates of a right conscience. Who will determine just what kind of conscience is "right?" *The pope*. He once caused an armada of 3,000 vessels to sail against England because the British people had not the "right" kind of conscience. The only "right" kind of conscience, according to Roman doctrine, is that

which prompts the believer to act in submission to the pope. The pope, being the representative of God on earth, is infallible, and all his utterances are binding upon the conscience of "good" Catholics. As the vicar of Christ on earth, he claims supreme authority in all things temporal and spiritual. Cardinal Manning wrote: "No just Prince can be deposed by any power on earth; but whether a Prince is just or not, is a matter for the pope to judge of." Just so in regard to Cardinal Gibbon's statement, above quoted: "Whether a conscience is right or not, is a matter for the pope to judge of."

"Centuries have passed," said Bishop Burt (M. E.), in an article contributed to the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* of October 19, 110, —

"since our fathers broke with Rome, and a new generation has arisen that knows little about the Protestant exodus and of the struggles in the wilderness. Some from a cowardly dislike of religious controversy, some from fear of damaging their personal interests or of disturbing their personal peace and comfort, and some from a desire to appear tolerant, liberal, and broad-minded in these days, prefer to be silent on the Romish question. It seems to be an inconvenient subject for those who have political aspirations, for the lawyer, the doctor, the merchant, because of the tyranny which Rome exercises through her tremendous organization. Hence many public men have deliberately ignored the subject, while some of our church members regard it as a 'bore.' The result is, on the part of the people, a lamentable ignorance both of the evils from which the Reformation delivered us and of the blessings which the Reformation brought us.

"Whatever we have of religious liberty in the nation, of purity and happiness in the home, and of personal independence of conscience, we owe to the Protestant Reformation, to separation from the Roman Catholic Church."

No, the church of Rome has not yielded one iota in its claims of temporal power, and Cardinal Gibbons' words must not be understood as marking a recession from the position formerly held by the Roman church in

regard to liberty of worship. Pope Pius X in his Catechism of 1905 enjoined upon every Catholic the duty of accepting every official utterance of the popes as divinely inspired. Leo XIII in an Encyclical of the year 1884 (Herder, p. 27.29) declared the doctrine of religious freedom, as we understand it, to be an error originating in the "Kingdom of Satan," and that is the doctrine of the Catholic church to-day. It will persecute those holding other faiths than the Roman, wherever she holds the balance of political power. Catholic bishops must, at their consecration, swear, each one of them, as already quoted: "I shall, according to my power, persecute and oppose all heretics, schismatics and rebels against our Lord and his successors" (the popes).

A Catholic family paper, the *Western Watchman*, several years ago discussed this question of tolerance in its bearing upon the future of Protestantism in America. The article is headed: "Afraid We Will Get Them." The following sentences will furnish suitable food for meditation:

"What the Protestants oppose, and what they wish to emphasize by their vote, is that they do not want to be dragooned into the Catholic church. They fear that if the Catholic church should get the upper hand in this country, she might induce the State to suppress all heretical worship, and compel all to embrace the Catholic faith. And this fear is not irrational, if unfounded. The Church has persecuted. Only a tyro in church history will deny that. * * * Protestants were persecuted in France and Spain with the full approval of the Church authorities. We have always defended the persecution of the Huguenots, and the Spanish Inquisition. Wherever and whenever there is honest Catholicity, there will be a clear distinction drawn between truth and error, and Catholicity and all forms of heresy. When she thinks it good to use physical force, the Church will use it. * * *

"But will the Catholic church give bond that she will not persecute at all? Will she guarantee absolute freedom and equality of all churches and all faiths? The Catholic church

30 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

gives no bonds for her good behavior. She has made mistakes in her policy which she promptly corrected as soon as discovered. She has countenanced violence when more humane measures would have been of more avail. Her children and her clergy have often been carried away by popular passion. But she gives no bonds that such things shall not occur again."

What is desired is "freedom of worship" — on the Spanish plan: The Roman church free to conduct her activities, with the backing of the entire military force; and the Protestant churches closed by the police if a sign-board was attached announcing the hour of services! Or the Portuguese kind of liberty, which, while it lasted, made a provision of \$8,000,000 a year to the Catholic church from the public treasury, and prohibited the reading of the Bible under penalty of imprisonment.

In his famous article, "The Church and the Republic," contributed March, 1909, to the *North American Review*, Cardinal Gibbons pointed out that there is no danger of a collision between State and Church in our country, because "the distinction between the civil and the ecclesiastical power is very firmly established in Catholic teaching."

On this last point we entertain no manner of doubt. But there is a difference between Distinction and Separation. We distinguish between the right and left auricles of the heart; but we do not separate them. We, too, uphold the distinction between temporal and spiritual powers; and what is more, we plead for their continued separation. What are Cardinal Gibbons' expressions on this matter? He quotes Pius IX, who approved a pastoral of the Swiss bishops which teaches that civil magistrates — meaning judges, police officers, etc. — "are invested in their own domain with full sovereignty"; and the Jesuit Tarquini, who wrote thus: "Civil society," (as for instance, our American republic,) "even though every

member of it be a Catholic, is not subject to the Church, but plainly independent." If the sentence concluded here we should feel reassured as regards the Jesuit Tarquini. But it doesn't. It continues in this wise: plainly independent "in temporal things which regard its temporal end. * * * For, whatsoever is done in temporal matters, having in view a temporal end, is outside the object of the church. * * * Hence it follows that the state, although it be composed of Catholics, yet in temporal matters and from a temporal point of view" — not from the spiritual (i. e., Roman Catholic) point of view! — "is by no means subordinate to the Church, but quite independent of her."

Now, we should call this a fine piece of Jesuit workmanship. The average American voter, untrained in the dialectic art, will forthwith conclude that the Roman Catholic bogie-man owes its origin to the overheated imagination of a few Protestant ministers; that as a matter of fact, the Roman Church very plainly teaches the separation of church and state, the limits of each being "fixed by nature for its purpose." But give the passage a second reading — do you find the word "separate" or "separation" in it? You do not. Do you find a clear-cut distinction between church and state? You do not. Note the limiting phrases: "In temporal things which regard its temporal end," "having in view a temporal end," the state is independent of the (Roman Catholic) church; "in their own domain" the officers of the law are independent of ecclesiastical rule.

Evidently, there is a border-territory of temporal and spiritual authority. The possibility remains that the church does not interfere in matters of government, even in temporal things (as, for instance, the making of laws, the distribution of public moneys, the education of chil-

32 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

dren) — when these matters “have not in view a temporal end,” that is to say, when they in some manner affect the welfare of the (Roman) church. Then these things would cease to “have in view only a temporal end,” would they not?

The Jesuit Tarquini does not say that civil authority and ecclesiastical authority are two distinct powers that must be kept separate. Any Roman Catholic who would dare so to teach would be taken most severely to task. We have in mind a controversy which took place about thirty-five years ago between the Rev. Thomas Bouquillon and several of his brother ecclesiastics, on the question: “Education — to whom does it belong?” Dr. Bouquillon was Professor of Moral Theology at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. He argued for the right of the state in the education of children. In the course of his discussion he took occasion to make this distinction: “Civil society and its inherent authority are in the natural order; the Church and its inherent authority are in the supernatural order.” Were this distinction carried to its logical conclusion, we could not find fault with it; as stated, it expresses exactly the position held by the Lutheran church. But Dr. Bouquillon, by making this concession to the Protestant idea of civil and ecclesiastical relations, embroiled himself in a bitter controversy with his co-religionists. In criticizing the sentence just quoted, Rev. James Conway (Jesuit) of Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y., had this to say:

“In the abstract it is most true that civil authority always regards the temporal, the profane; but, in the concrete, he who wields the civil power may also be invested with spiritual, supernatural power, whether in virtue of his office as the pope, who is lawful temporal sovereign, and in virtue of his office is at the same time supreme pontiff, or by delegation, as in the case of a temporal sovereign or ruler, who, by agreement or usage may perform certain spiritual functions . . .” And again: “It is only

in the abstract that state power is everywhere substantially the same in infidel and Protestant as well as in Catholic nations."

Rev. Conway then quotes the theologian Suarez who says that rulers of Christian (i. e. Roman Catholic) countries "can punish those vices and crimes that are specifically against the Christian religion as such, e. g. heresy, the Jewish rite of circumcision, etc." "Some of these acts," says Suarez, "belong to the civil authority, not themselves, but by concession of the ecclesiastical authority, and, as it were, by a tacit or express invocation of the secular arm."

Compare with these expressions of Catholic theologians the language of Gibbons' article, and the specious character of his argument must become patent to the reader. The Church, he says, teaches that we owe obedience and respect to civil magistrates "in all things morally permitted and belonging to the domain of civil society." But he does not say that his church in preponderatingly Catholic countries claims for itself the right to invest the civil authorities with power to punish Heresy, for instance — and heresy is any deviation from Roman Catholic doctrine, all Protestant churches being termed heretic by the Romanist. Hence the Cardinal carefully refrains from saying: The Church has no right to interfere in matters of government. Instead he says: Catholics would not be bound to yield the Pope obedience "were he to issue commands in purely civil matters." Note that word: "PURELY." It recurs on page 334 of the *Review*: "We may put aside, then, as an absurdity the injurious supposition that the Pope would ever interfere in purely civil affairs." Gibbons did not explain the difference between "civil affairs" and "*purely* civil affairs." We might inquire: Is the education of children a "civil affair," or a "purely civil affair?" Is the granting of a building permit to a Lutheran congregation a "purely" civil affair? Is the public sale of the Holy Scriptures a matter "belonging to the domain of civil

34 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

society?" In countries predominantly Catholic the church has declared again and again: No, indeed not; the erection of heretic churches, the sale of the Holy Scriptures, the education of the country's youth are matters immediately affecting the welfare of the Roman church; are not "purely temporal affairs." And civil authorities have been invested with the power to destroy the property of heretical church bodies, to burn publicly the Holy Scriptures, to inflict the death penalty upon Protestants.

What did Cardinal Gibbons mean by representing a modification or change of the relations that now exist between church and state in our country as "a power theoretically reserved to our State Governments?" Why "theoretically reserved?" We are here reminded of a maxim laid down by Mgr. Cavagnis, of the Pontifical Seminary in Rome: "States are parts of the Church, and as such are bound to procure the good of the whole." In theory — and the "theory" Cardinal Gibbons had in mind, is, we fear, the doctrine of the Constitution of the United States — in theory, then, the separate states of the Union have the right to decide what shall be the relation of government to religion, and whether the present status of religious liberty shall endure; but that, we are given to understand, is the abstract theory. In the concrete, the states are merely part of the Church, and as such "are bound to procure the good of the whole" — the Church ultimately possessing the power to say just what is good for the country, and what isn't.

Cardinal Gibbons cunningly evaded the issue. There is in these sixteen solid pages of type not one expression that flat-footedly declares for the rigid separation of church and state guaranteed by our American constitution. Not a hint as to the exact nature of the things

included under the term "purely" temporal affairs. Possibly legislation requiring the use of red cans for the storage of gasoline, or village ordinances denying hogs the right to run unfettered upon "all streets, lanes, and alleys within the corporate limits of said village of Podunk," or the issuance of hunting licences, are "purely" temporal affairs. But as to the appointment of teachers in the schools, for instance, we have no assurance guarding against such measures being enacted by a Catholic legislature as were provided in a letter of Pope Clement XIV to the King of Poland, December 18, 1773: "No one shall have the right to teach unless he previously place a confession of his faith in the hands of his ordinarius (priest), such confession to be renewed once a year, as prescribed in the sacred canons."

In the "Vatican Decrees" (Murray, 1874) Gladstone says that no man can become "a convert to Rome without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another"; and of such a man he says, he "intends, in case of any conflict between the Queen and the Pope, to follow the Pope, and let the Queen shift for herself" (pp. 6.28. Quoted by Dallmann).

In an address delivered in New York City on January 1, 1888, by Mgr. Preston, and published in the *New York Herald* of January 2, we have in the following language a confirmation of how the dignitaries of the church view the pope's claims as to the political control of every Roman Catholic citizen. It reads as follows:

"From the chair of Peter comes nothing but infallible and unwavering truth. Every word from that high chair is the voice of God. The voice of Peter is to be obeyed as the voice of God. When our obedience is asked we obey no man, we obey God, and the vicar of Christ has authority to speak for his Divine Master. It is said that politics is not within the province

36 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

of the church, and that the church has jurisdiction only in matters of faith. You say, 'I will receive my faith from the pontiff, but I will not receive my politics from him.' This assertion is disloyal and untruthful * * * You must not think as you choose; you must think as Catholics. The man who says, 'I will take my faith from Peter, but I will not take my politics from Peter,' is not a good Catholic."

When we accuse the Papacy of interference in civil affairs, we are often met with the plausible answer that the Pope claims *only a jurisdiction over questions of "faith and morals."* Maybe the answer satisfies the less thoughtful, but those to whom a superficial view of things in general is not satisfying will look deeper into the matter. It would be a good thing if all Protestants realized to the full the real significance of the Pope's claim to absolute and exclusive jurisdiction over "faith and morals." Remember, he does not mean "faith and morals" of Roman Catholics only: he means that he claims control over *all* questions relating to "faith and morals" in the State. But it is very far from easy to mention any aspect of human life and endeavor which is not bound up in the question of "faith and morals." Almost every act we perform or omit to perform may be said to be affected by questions of "faith and morals." By claiming this *apparently* innocent-looking jurisdiction, the Papacy really claims for herself the right to interfere with and control practically every branch of the public life. As to how it may be extended and enlarged so as to become an ecclesiastical tyranny may be seen by a perusal of a book by "Father" Henry C. Day, S. J., entitled "Catholic Democracy, Individualism, and Socialism," published in London. The following passage by the Jesuit was quoted by *The Tablet* in a eulogistic review: Father Day admirably delineates the authority which his church claims over civil affairs, when he declares that she

"recognizes that she has clear and imperative duties to society in regard to the general moral bearing of political and economical questions. Thus she accepts the responsibility of considering the general relation of the State to the individual, of capital to labor, of masters to servants, and of making definite pronouncements on such subjects, whenever justice, or charity, or the good of society requires it. In these and in all other questions of human actions which entail an immediate moral issue, the Church claims to be the ultimate authority to decide what is right and what is wrong."

A letter to the editor of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* in 1928 contained this lucid statement:

"The Roman Catholic says, and every honest, sincere Roman Catholic will tell you this, that the corner stone of the Roman Catholic Church is the decree of papal infallibility, that is to say, that decree was passed by the college of Cardinals in 1870, in the Vatican Council in Rome, making the Roman Pontiff infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra*. That decree declares that he is supreme in all things and over all things. They say, 'In faith and morals,' but that includes practically everything. You take out faith and morals and what have you got left? You make a contract. What is it based on? It is based on faith and morals. Every Government is founded on faith and morals. Every law on the statute books is founded on faith and morals, and therefore when Gov. Al Smith says, 'That the decree of papal infallibility has only to do with the realms of faith and morals,' he includes all there is of soul and body and the life of a human being. That is as clear as daylight."

"Morals" includes the whole field of human actions, of individuals or nations, according to Antonelli, Papal Secretary of State, says Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*; p. 21).

An address by a Worcester, Mass., attorney, in 1922, as quoted by the *Brooklyn Eagle*, reads as follows:

"Catholicity is one of the crowning jewels of Christianity, and it has the foundation of years. It is the word of God under the direction and the guidance of the Catholic Church. The coming of the Catholic Church

38 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

was told at Bethlehem and its first music was the singing of the angels who heralded the approach of the child Jesus. Its organization began with the teachings of Jesus and it has continued down through the years to the present day. Its representatives are instructed without doubt and *are vested with power absolute*. For several hundred years there was only one Church, and St. Peter was the only acknowledged leader. Then came Luther, with his doctrine of private interpretation. Luther's doctrine would ruin the United States in six months. The Supreme Court would be a mockery if every man were allowed to interpret the law of the country in his own particular way and allowed to apply that interpretation."

"Vested with power absolute" is good Catholic doctrine. It extends to the suppression of "heresy" by force.

A work by Rev. Father Marianus de Luca, S. J., professor in the Gregorian University at Rome, bears the title: *Institutiones Juris Ecclesiastici*. It was published by the well-known Catholic Publisher Pustet, Regensburg, with the full and unreserved approval from the heads of the Order of Jesus, and it has also received the highest praise in the leading Jesuit Review, *Civiltà Cattolica*. In the first of these volumes, pp. 142-149, the distinguished author reveals the mind of the Jesuit order of today on the killing of heretics. The author contends:

1. That the Church of Christ, i. e., the Roman Catholic Church, has the right to inflict corporal punishment, and even death ("*ius infligendi poenas corporales, etiam mortem*," p. 142);
2. that as a *Societas Perfecta* the Church must kill (pg. 142);
3. That the killing of heretics is conducive to faith (pg. 143);
4. that the Church is better entitled to kill than the state (pp. 143-144);
5. that the request to the civil magistrate not to kill is a comedy (pg. 145);
6. that the state is bound to kill

when so ordered by the Church (p. 145); 7. that not the amendment of the heretic but his death is necessary (p. 146); 8. that there is no graver offense than heresy, and that it must be exterminated by fire and sword (p. 147); 9. that civil governments refusing to kill heretics are deposed and confiscated (p. 148); 10. and finally, that flogging, fining, banishment and perpetual imprisonment, etc., may also be resorted to by the Church against heretics (p. 149).

Despairing of the slow progress made by his Order in the use of milder methods of wiping out Protestantism and other such "heretic" movements, a Jesuit priest in France last year called upon all of his fellow-Roman Catholics to rise at once and inflict the death penalty upon all who continue to disregard the will of the pope. This profound judgment, which was pronounced in the course of an address in Tourraine by Father Antoine Oldra at the "Church of the Holy Martyrs" was given to the secular press for publicity. According to *Semaine Religieuse*, "The speaker justified the application of the death penalty for heretics, a practice prevalent in the dark ages of medieval times, and demanded the re-introduction of its practice."

According to *L'Echo des Vallees*, which quoted an official copy of the speech, Father Oldra had the following to say, among other things:

"As the Church has exhausted all sources of Christian patience, as every attempt of conviction, every spiritual encouragement, every material inducement remains without effect, and the guilty ones continue their heretic propaganda and insist obstinately on discrediting the social order and the peace of the Christian confessions, there is nothing else left but the death penalty if the Church and its members are to be protected and heresy subjugated to the true interpretation and to the obedience of the Catholic doctrine. Do you remember, gentlemen, that the heretics have never ceased to attack the Catholic faith? They are

40 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

malignant, immoral, abominable, mean, full of malice, without shame, anti-patriotic, unsocial. Think of the heresy of the Waldensians, Albigensians, Anglicans, Lutherans, and all those Vandals who were covetous of Christian blood. Think of it, gentlemen, that a heretic is worse than the greatest criminal, and your consciences will never be at peace if the death penalty is not employed to destroy all seeds of that material infection."

Father Lépicier, Professor of Theology at the Propaganda College and an adviser of the Biblical Commission appointed by the Pope, some twenty years ago, published in Rome a book for the use of students called "The Stability and Progress of Dogma." This book contains the following passages:

First part, Article V, Sec. 9: "Whether and in what matter heretics are to be tolerated * * * If any one makes public profession of heresy or tries to pervert others, by word or by example, he ought not merely, absolutely speaking, to be excommunicated, but he may also be justly killed, lest his contagious and dangerous example should cause loss to others. In fact, a wicked man, says Aristotle, is worse than a beast and does more harm, from which it follows that if it is not wrong to kill a beast of the forest, especially if it be mischievous, so it may be a good action to deprive a heretic man of the power of carrying on a mischievous life, as an injurer of divine truth and an enemy of the health of other men."

In section 10, the author says that many theologians have thought they might deny to the Roman Church the right of decreeing the death penalty against any man, either for heresy or any other crime, "but," he adds: "how this can be reconciled with the constitution of the Church and the facts of history does not appear clearly enough to enable me to treat it as acceptable."

Section 11. "How the Church proceeds with heretics." Two preliminary warnings, then excommunication. After which "If this fails the Church delivers the heretic man to secular judgment, in order that he may be exterminated from the world by death."

"Further, it cannot be denied that the Church, absolutely speaking, has the right to put heretics to death, even if they have come to repentance."

In this book the author condemns all separation of Church and State, and denies the lawfulness of any system which would grant to each reciprocal independence. He also claims for the Pope the right to depose apostate princes (*Principes apostati ab imperio possunt deponi auctoritate Summi Pontificis*). In reply to theologians who have contested that right he declares that he sees no way that it can be denied or even doubted, without compromising the integrity of the faith.

In "A Modernist's Letters to Pope Pius X," published by the Open Court, Chicago, the author quotes (page 24) from St. Thomas Aquinas:

"Respecting heretics, we have two observations to make: In the first place they are guilty of a sin by which they deserve to be excluded, not only from the Church by excommunication, but from the world by death. * * * In the second place, the Church is merciful unto the conversion of the erring, and does not straightway condemn. It is far more criminal to corrupt the faith which is the life of the soul than to counterfeit the coin of the realm which is a convenience for earthly life. And if counterfeiters and other malefactors are justly put to death by the secular power, for a greater reason may heretics, when convicted of heresy, be not only excommunicated but justly killed."

Quoting further from St. Thomas on the same subject "Modernist" says: "When the heretic is stubborn, the Church, despairing of his conversion, provides for the safety of others by cutting him off from the Church through sentence of excommunication, and finally by yielding him up to the secular power to be killed (a

mundo exterminandum per mortem). * * * But when heretics relapse again into heresy, it is a sign of inconstancy in faith; and therefore when they once more come back they are allowed indeed to do penance, but are not free from sentence of death" (*Summa*—pars 2a 2dae quaest, XI—art. 3 et 4).

The following words from the pen of Father Ronal Knox, in "The Belief of Catholics," a book recently written by this priest, plainly shows that the Pope's Church indeed demands religious liberty for itself, but is by no means willing to grant it to others: "For the reason that the unchecked development of false theories results in ethical aberrations, which are a menace to the social order, a body of Catholic patriots, entrusted with the government of a Catholic state, will not shrink even from repressive measures in order to perpetuate the secure domination of Catholic principles among their fellow-countrymen. But if it be argued that it is unreasonable for them to complain when a modern state restricts, in its turn, the political liberty which they themselves wish to enjoy, the answer is that when we demand liberty in the modern state, we are appealing to its own principles, not to ours." (Statement quoted in a book review of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* of December 17, 1927.)

Considerable attention has been directed to the "Manual of Christian Doctrine," intended as a text book for high schools, academies and colleges, revised to conform with the Code of 1918 and bearing the *Imprimatur* of Cardinal Daugherty. Without further comment we submit for the consideration of the reader the following statements, approved by one of the most notable of the American Cardinals:

"Does the Pope possess none but spiritual powers?

"He also possesses temporal power in the State of the Church." (p. 128.)

"What right has the Pope in virtue of this supremacy?

"The right to annul those laws or acts of the government that would injure the salvation of souls or attack the natural rights of citizens.

"What more should the State do than respect the rights and the liberty of the Church?

"The State should also aid, protect, and defend the Church.

"What is the principal obligation of the heads of States?

"Their principal obligation is to practise the Catholic religion themselves, and as they are in power to protect and defend it.

"Has the State the right and the duty to proscribe (outlaw) schism or heresy?

"Yes, it has the right and the duty to do so both for the good of the nation, and for that of the faithful themselves; for religious unity is the principal foundation of social unity.

"May the State separate itself from the Church?

"No, because it may not withdraw from the supreme rule of Christ."

The Rev. J. C. Mattes has made this appropriate comment on the extracts above reprinted:

"So long as the exalted members of the hierarchy lend their approval to the dissemination of such ideals as those of the Manual just quoted no professions of Roman clergy or laity can make us believe that the ideals of the Roman communion are not in conflict with certain fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States."

The latest authoritative text, from a Catholic source, on the relation of the Church to the State is "The State and the Church," by Dr. John A. Ryan and Father M. F. X. Millar, S. J., published by MacMillan, New York, 1922. Prof. Ryan was professor of moral theology at the Catholic University of America, and has since been made president of that institution. The book has the official approval of the Catholic censor and of Archbishop Hayes of New York, one of the American cardinals. It reprints in full the Encyclical of Leo XIII entitled

44 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

Immortale Dei. The chapters in the book are chiefly comment on this document. Needless to emphasize, all the statements of the Supreme Pontiff are approved, the chief purpose of the book being to show that Roman Catholics can accept the *Immortale Dei* and remain loyal to a government which has decreed separation of Church and State as one of its basic principles of political life.

This is the way in which Dr. Ryan voices his approval to the doctrine that the State must recognize "the true religion." To begin with, the author emphasizes the fact that "this means the religion professed by the Catholic Church." As for the doctrine of State recognition, he says that this principle, as here set forth, "has complete and unconditional application only to Catholic States" (p. 33). But he hastens to add a quotation from Pope Leo's Encyclical "On Catholicity in the United States," to this effect: "It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful and expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. * * * She (the Catholic Church) would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority."

As for the ideal relation, Dr. Ryan gives us this luminous summary (p. 34): "The State should officially recognize the Catholic religion as the religion of the commonwealth; accordingly it should invite the blessing and the ceremonial participation of the Church for certain important public functions, as the opening of legislative sessions, the erection of public buildings, etc., and delegate its officials to attend certain of the more important festival celebrations of the Church; it should recognize and sanction the laws of the Church; and it should pro-

tect the right of the Church, and the religious as well as the other rights of the Church's members." Excepting only the last clause, this program, if carried into effect, would mean the abrogation of the Constitutional Amendment which prohibits the "establishment" of any Church, or recognition of an official religion.

Now, asks Dr. Ryan, "does State recognition of the Catholic religion necessarily imply that no other religion shall be tolerated?" Let us say right here that even if the Doctor's answer were a clear cut Yes, the thing would still be fundamentally wrong. As has often been pointed out, the American constitution does not "tolerate" religion; it has, — and in this it agrees with the viewpoint of the Augsburg Confession — as little to do with religion as it has with music or with the art of rhetoric. What we stand for is not toleration of religion or of all religion, but freedom of religion, which is a different matter entirely. But Dr. Ryan, expounding under official approval the Encyclical of Leo XIII, does not even grant toleration. Should the unbaptized and the non-Catholic be permitted to practise their own form of worship? His answer is Yes, if these are carried on "within the family or in such an inconspicuous manner as to be an occasion neither of scandal nor of perversion of the faithful, they may properly be tolerated by the state." This, he says, would apply in the ideal Catholic state to the Jews, for instance. As for the "non-Catholic *sects*," the Doctor is far more guarded. His sentences should be read with a pause after every word: "The same principle regarding freedom of worship seems fairly applicable to baptized persons who were born into a non-Catholic sect. For their participation in false worship does not necessarily imply a wilful affront to the true Church nor a menace to public order or social welfare."

46 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTORS.

The sentences should be read again, with close attention to each adverb and adjective. They are meaningful. Again: "If there is only one true religion, and if its possession is the most important good in life for States as well as individuals, then the public profession, protection, and promotion of this religion and the legal prohibition of all direct assaults upon it, become one of the most obvious and fundamental duties of the State" (p. 37).

In other words, if America had been changed over in its constitutional law into the Catholic ideal state — and we have seen that the pope has made it the duty of every Catholic to labor toward the end — then it would be the most obvious and fundamental duty of the American government to adopt such laws as would forever render it impossible to disseminate Luther's works, or D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," or Lea's books on the Inquisition, or Chemnitz "Examen," or even such a humble literary effort as the reader is now perusing.

World-wide Aggression.

3. World-wide Aggression.

"Resolved that this convention of school trustees of Saskatchewan request the department of education to remove without further delay, French text book 'Cours Francais de Lectures Graduees,' from the public schools of this province in which it is now in use. The text book has been de-authorized by the department of education, and contains religious teaching contrary to the School Act and the Protestant faith."

The resolution quoted above was carried almost unanimously, February 24, 1928, at a session of the convention of Saskatchewan School Trustees at Saskatoon, Canada. It brought speakers to their feet who quoted extracts from the book in question and strongly condemned the use of it in public schools, claiming that the extracts read were sufficient to indicate that it was anti-Protestant.

Following is a translation from page 152 of the text book in question as read by A. Nesbitt, of Dummer, a representative of the school district responsible for the resolution:

"In 1897 at London, a Protestant minister entered one day a Catholic church with his little child of five years. The little girl noticed the lamp which burned before the altar, and said to her father: 'Father, why this lamp?'"

"'It is, my daughter, to mark the presence of Jesus, who is behind that little golden door.'"

"'My father, I would like to see Jesus.'"

"'My child, the door is not open. He is hidden, you cannot see Him.'"

"The child replied, 'Oh, I would like to see Jesus.'"

"They next went into a Protestant church. Note, no lamp."

" 'Father,' said the child, 'Why is there no lamp here?'

" 'My child, it is because Jesus is not here.'

"And since then the child would talk of nothing but the church where the lamp burned.

" 'I would like to be where Jesus is,' she said.

"The father was touched, and wavered. He must renounce his faith, and for him it meant ruin. No matter (at what cost), this was not important.

"The father and the mother were converted, saying: 'Let us go where Jesus is.'

"To-day they are poor, but they are where Jesus is."

I have recorded this bit of artful Roman machination as an introduction to a selected number of examples illustrating the efforts of Rome, literally world-wide, to increase the prestige of the papacy, ever with the purpose in mind of gaining political ascendancy. Sometimes with craft and cunning, sometimes with brazen arrogance, the Church seeks upon the five continents and upon the high seas to establish herself in the ancient role of mistress of men.

To begin with, in practically every country of Europe — Russia is the exception — and of America — the United States and Canada being the sole exceptions, — there exists a "clerical party," which is simply the Roman Church in politics, with her bishops as the guiding and controlling spirits. A few examples, both from the *Catholic New World* (Chicago) of the year 1920:

"London, November 19 — Latest returns from municipal elections show that the Catholic candidates have managed to hold their own. In Liverpool the Irish Nationalist Party had splendid success and captured four additional seats, making the party representation in the City Council twenty seats. The Catholic voters in many Lancashire industrial districts have taken the lead from Liverpool, and the result is in three great manufacturing towns Catholic candidates have secured election. Manchester has returned two Irish Catholic members; Blackburn, four

Catholics, of whom two are Conservatives, and two, Labor; and at Bolton two Catholics were successful and three unsuccessful. Bootle returned its Catholic candidates unopposed, and Birmingham elected one Catholic member with a large majority, making a representation of three in the City Council."

"Paris, July 28 — The power of the Catholic deputies in the new German Reichstag is commented upon by *Les Nouvelles Religieuses* in a recent article which surveys the late elections from a Catholic point of view, and points out that to the Center party's force of sixty-eight votes must be added the eighteen deputies of the Bavarian Popular party, and five Hanoverians, all of whom, in all great questions vitally affecting Catholics, would very likely vote as one. With this strength, it points out, the Catholic elements form a compact force of 93 out of 460 votes, which no party can afford to ignore."

The French bishops in 1910 publicly forbade Catholic parents under penalty of refusal of the sacraments to send their children to the public schools. The Bishop of Rennes boldly called upon the Catholic voters to make war on the Republic in this matter at the next elections. He says, "It is immaterial whether candidates are Royalist, Imperialist, or Republican, we only insist that they be Catholic above everything." Electoral committees of Catholics were formed, in some cases under the direct leadership of bishops and clergy. The language used by the upholders of the Papacy against the Government varies according to the nature of local Catholicism. The Bishop of Autun tells his people to "choose a candidate who will vote according to your beliefs in religious matters"; but Monsignor Guerard, Bishop of Coutances, after describing France as the prey of politicians who are bringing about "universal decomposition," concludes: "If all the Catholics of France will unite at the coming elections they will put an end to the crimes against religion and liberty which the coalition of Judaism, Freemasonry and Protestantism is committing."

The practical lesson for all Americans to learn from these things is, that if our Government sufficiently offended the Vatican, the Papacy would be as active in American politics as it was in France in 1910.

By a special apostolic letter, Pope Pius IX prohibited Italian Catholics from voting at political elections. Since that time an exception was only made in the city of Rome some years ago with such "excellent results," that the ban was lifted in 1916 when (December 16th) "many priests and monks took part in the elections." A bit of Roman Catholic news, illustrative of the "liberal" spirit of the modern Church of Rome, under conditions where she can safely show her true self, was published in *The Lutheran Observer* in 1909:

"Father Romolo Murri, leader of the Catholic Liberals and a representative of the Social Democrats, was on the 21st of March publicly excommunicated at Rome and cast out of the Church as well as out of the priesthood. His offense consisted in having stood for a seat in the Italian parliament and having publicly criticised the political policy of the pope. In 1897 he was suspended and warned to receive his political opinions from the curia. But instead of proving docile and penitent, he accepted a nomination to parliament, was elected, and took his seat. Thereupon he was excommunicated, and all loyal Catholics are forbidden to have any business, social, or political relation with him. Father Murri has been since 1902 director of the National Society for Cultural Education, which publishes a monthly magazine in the interests of Christian socialism. He had been warned to withdraw from this organization, and his persistence in the relation is another reason why he is cast out and the thunders of papal anathema launched at him. Perhaps Cardinal Gibbons may, however, find in this attitude of the Vatican another proof of the liberal and democratic spirit of the 'holy father,' and Archbishop Ireland may discover in it another proof that the principles of our republic were drawn from Catholic sources."

In this connection the "Il Nuncio" flag incident will bear retelling. I have before me the press-dispatch of 1916:

"Rome, June 23, 1916: According to a report the internuncio Mgr. Locatelli has been transferred from Buenos Ayres to Brussels. A steamer, expressly chartered and bearing the name Nuncius, will fly the white and yellow Papal flag, as the colors of a neutral power. A ship flew the papal colors in the harbor of Civita Vecchia, 37 miles northwest of Rome in 1870; but this is the first time they appeared on the ocean."

Rome, July 14, 1916: Report is made that the Holy See has not chartered the Spanish vessel "Il Nuncio" to carry Mgr. Torregrossa to the Argentine Republic, "neither will the Papal flag be flown." According to a "sea-lawyer" the Holy See has a right "as a sovereign power" to "possess ships and fly its flag on them." The possibilities of the Vatican with access to the Mediterranean are also hinted at. The Papal flag has, however, been flown by the following ships: The vessels that brought Cardinals-elect Farley and O'Connell to Rome, and Cardinals Gibbons and O'Connell to the Conclave; the "Empress of Ireland" which took Cardinals Vannutelli, Bourne and Logue and a host of Bishops and Prelates to the Eucharistic Congress in Montreal; the British gunboat which took Cardinal Ferrata as Pontifical Legate from Syracuse to Malta for the Eucharistic Congress there.

Rev. Raffaele De Pierro, pastor of the Italian church of Montreal, Canada, writes with regard to the "papal" flag that was hoisted on the ship taking the Papal Nuncio to Buenos Ayres: "It was a Spanish boat, sailing under the Spanish flag, that brought the Nuncio from Italy to South America. The boat, when in the high sea, changed flag, and then, and *only then*, the papal flag was seen on it. That would not be permitted in an Italian port, as no papal flag is recognized or can fly in any part of the Italian Kingdom."

In 1914 an organization was formed in France similar to the Italian "Catholic Electoral Union." As in Italy, the full force of the ecclesiastical machinery was put into motion. Cardinal Andrieu, of Bordeaux, said *The Tablet* March 21, reminded his flock that they should use their votes, and that in doing so they are bound in conscience to vote only for those candidates who shall have promised to respect "the rights of God and the

Church." "Those," he declared, "who decline to make this promise are undeserving of your confidence, and if, from fear or from self-interest, you vote for them, you make yourselves responsible before God and men for the harm that may be done by their sectarianism to our religion and to our country." Cardinal Dubillard, of Chambéry, in his pastoral, wrote to the same effect. But the strongest declaration of all, and one which goes a long way to prove the contention of Protestants, that the Papacy claims the right to rule and direct not only those matters which she calls "spiritual" but also civil affairs, was issued in a joint pastoral by the six Bishops of Bourges. They declare that in view of the elections it is their right and their duty to speak about them to the people who are under an obligation not only to vote but to vote right. The bishops added this significant point: "To vote is not an indifferent, because it is a political, act, for politics cannot escape from Christian morality or claim independence seeing that conscience is binding in public as well as in private life." *The Tablet*, [R. C.] March 21, 1914.

The secret treaty between the Vatican and Servia in 1914 made the Roman religion paramount in the state and obligated the government to support it in every particular, and this in a country where only one in every 300 persons was a Roman Catholic. The treaty was given at Rome on June 24, 1914, and was entitled "Concordat Between the Holy See and the Government of Serbia." It was signed by Raffaele, Cardinal Merry Del Val (papal secretary), and Mil. R. Vesnitch, representing Serbia. This copy of this treaty was obtained by Dr. Nations through the Serbian Legation at Washington. Dr. Nations says that for some time the Roman Catholic Hapsburg empire of Austria and Hungary desired the

subjugation of the small adjoining country of Serbia. In 1914, after Serbia had passed through two wars, both Vienna and Rome considered that the time was at hand to gain control of Serbia. The result was a secret treaty between Serbia and Rome. Among the terms of this treaty were: The free and public exercises of the Roman religion in Serbia; Serbia to become an ecclesiastical province, composed of the Archdiocese of Belgrade, with its seat at Vienna, and the suffragan Diocese of Uskub. These were to depend for ecclesiastical affairs directly and exclusively upon the Holy See. Both these dignitaries were to receive an annual allowance from the Royal Government, with the right to a pension at least equal to the officers of the state. The papal dignitaries had control of teachings in the schools so far as to appoint the teachers of the catechism, and the state was to pay the salary of these teachers. Other similar powers and functions were given to the Catholic authorities in Serbia. These and other provisions were designed for the complete subjugation by the papal power and by the intrigues of the civil powers of Bohemia. The papal authorities boasted of their accomplishments and in this boasting they let out the secret of the treaty. This resulted in stirring up the liberty-loving people of Serbia, and this, in turn, resulted in the shooting of Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, and this brought on the World War.

The formation of a Catholic *international* organization was urged by a Catholic member of Parliament, John McKean, in an address at London July 25, 1919. He urged that such an organization was absolutely necessary for the defense of the Papacy. He referred to the secret treaty of the Allies with Italy, in which the Italian government was given certain guarantees against the Pope's temporal ambitions. A Catholic World League would

be the only adequate protest against this treatment of the Holy Father and would give the Pope "a temporal power greater than any of his predecessors ever enjoyed" since through such a League the "Roman question" could be settled by "outside pressure," which the speaker termed the only effective means.

From the camp of the Roman church we often hear voices which try to make it appear as though the pope and his followers were pleased, yea, delighted with the separation of State and church obtaining in the United States and guaranteed by the Constitution. The assurance is given that the pope would not change it if he could. However, the true spirit of Rome is evidenced by the following Associated Press Dispatch: "Munich, December 20, 1927.—Catholic bishops under the leadership of the archbishop of the diocese of Wuerzburg, have protested formally against the separation of the Church and the State and the abolition of religious oversight of schools."

This reminds us that after the armistice the archbishops and bishops of Germany protested in a pastoral letter against the separation of Church and State as signifying a "bitter and godless violation of right. The enemies of Christ and the Church desire to separate what by divine and human right belongs together." They objected against an arrangement by which the church would not be rated higher by the state than any official club, and viewed with alarm the possibility that the Church might be despoiled of her property, 'gained by so much painful labor and careful husbandry.'

The Pope and the World War.

4. The Pope and the World War.

The Protestant Observer, October, 1914, pointed out the secret aims of the Pope and called him the "real war-lord of Europe." It declared him to be a politician and diplomat who is trying to act as "universal peacemaker with a view to gathering up for the benefit of the Papacy as many spoils as he can lay his hands upon after the conclusion of the Great War." It quoted from a Rome correspondent of *The Tablet* (R. C.) September 19, 1914, who said: "Most commentators now view the Holy See from the political side, and, while they prophesy great things during the coming Pontificate, speak of a 'wonderful combination' — the Holy Father and Cardinal Ferata as Secretary of State."

Rome had strong hope that the Papacy would again be established. Some time before the war commenced the Pope delivered a speech to the Consistory of Cardinals, and in exhorting them to be hopeful for the future of the Papacy, he drew their attention to the fact that one hundred years ago Pius VII was restored to Rome at the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars. His words intimated war: "To-day more than ever they seek for peace, and indeed we see classes of citizens, races, nations, fighting among themselves, and from the enmities ever becoming more intense among them we see break out sudden fearful wars." (*The Tablet*, June 6, 1914.)

That Rome expected to regain her Temporal Power as a result of the war is an absolute certainty. The *Pittsburg Observer* (R. C.) as early as 1914 declared that:

"Another possibility among the results of the present war in Europe is the restoration, in some form or other, of the Temporal

Power of the Roman Pontiffs. Catholics all over the world would heartily rejoice to see this; for they have never ceased to claim for the august head of the Church what he has never ceased to claim himself — the absolute freedom and independence of the Holy See. The latest suggestion in this connection which is said to have found favour in the Vatican is that a portion of the city which was stolen from Pius IX. in 1870 — the Eternal City of the Pope — the "Leonine" district — should be restored to him. This would secure for the Holy Father the absolute extra-territoriality a small part of which is at present guaranteed to him by an Italian law that is frequently violated by the Italian Government itself. Of course, in this matter as in all others Catholics will conform to the wishes of his Holiness, who has not yet stated what solution he would accept of this ever-present 'Roman Question' which the rulers of Italy would like to see completely forgotten. The Catholic world will not forget it, but will keep it open until it is settled in a manner satisfactory to the Sovereign Pontiff. Austria, the leading Catholic nation of Europe, has always shown itself willing to do whatever has been in its power to restore to the Pope something of his historic patrimony. An opportunity to put its desire into action may soon present itself. Its mighty ally, Germany, may be confidently relied upon to second whatever efforts it may be able to make in this direction."

We take the extracts printed below from the *Western Watchman*, published in St. Louis. Not many months previously, its editor, Father Phelan, had visited the late Pope, who blessed his journal and praised highly a volume of his sermons.

"The late Cardinal Rampolla always said that a general European war would undoubtedly restore Rome to the Pope. If Italy does not get into this war while it is on she will have to get out of Rome when it is over." — September 3, 1914.

"From a European war, it has been said, Cardinal Rampolla expected the settlement of the Roman question. In the struggle against Napoleon in 1815 the Roman Pontiff got back his liberty and his temporal possessions. Why not then (*sic*) whenever nations fell foul of each other and thus help honest men to come into their own?" — August 27, 1914.

"France has rescinded her decrees of banishment directed against the religious orders and restored the chaplains to their fleet. Next the law of separation will be repealed and the French Embassy at the Vatican will be restored. *All to culminate in the restoration of Rome to the Popes.*" — September 10, 1914.

Archbishop Glennon, of St. Louis, who had an interview with the Pope at 10:45 A. M. on June 16th, said shortly after his return: "We may hope that out of it the Cross will conquer once more." (*Western Watchman*, September 3, 1914). A Rome dispatch of the year 1916 declared that Catholic and non-Catholic writers in Italy upheld the advisability of the Holy Father's representation at the Peace Conference, thus falling in line with Cardinal Gasquet's article of June, 1915, which argues "for a moral sanction behind international agreements," the Pope being "the only efficacious moral sanction possible." His right to "take part with other heads of states" is unquestionable since he is the "only impartial and authoritative representative of right and justice." The Pope is "a sovereign who transcends all other sovereigns of the world."

In a *New World*, Chicago (R. C.) dispatch dated Rome, February 4, 1916, reference is made to a dispatch in the Swiss paper *Neue Züricher Nachrichten*, which comments on the Pact of London recently signed by Italy. It indicates that the Law of Guarantees will not be modified, and that the Pope will be excluded from the Peace Congress. The *New World* commented: "Every Catholic and every honest man knows that the presence of the Pope at the deliberations of the world * * * is the only guarantee that those deliberations will be of any use at all." The Pope, not having any territorial ambitions, would act as a spiritual guide. Comments of the *Corriere* are cited in part: "If the Pope took part in the Congress he would not raise any questions not contained in its

natural program: that of the settlement of the war." The same paper makes further reference to Cardinal Gasparri's authoritative utterances: that the Pope looks for a suitable settlement, not from foreign arms but from the recognition by Italy itself of where its true prosperity lies. The same paper declared the position of the Holy Father to be abnormal and that it has been recognized as such since 1870. In applying this to present circumstances the *Corriere* said: "As for the means by which the abnormality is to be eliminated, neither we Italian Catholics nor the Catholics of other countries are competent judges to decide; that belongs to the Pope alone and his word!" When he says that temporal power must be restored to him, it must be restored!

September 16, 1916: *Das Neue Europa* a monthly publication of Zurich, proposes as a basis of peace between Austro-Hungary and Italy that the Trentino shall form a new Papal State under the independent sovereignty of the Pope. The proposal outlines further that the boundaries of the Papal Trentino might be drawn on the north by Mezzolombardo, on the west along the Presanella group, and in the east northwards from Val Saugana. The southern frontier might be the present Tyrol border. The Vatican would scarcely reject it as a temporal ecclesiastical state, which in turn might be a blessing to all European countries. It is further pointed out that the Hapsburgs are perhaps the most loyal dynasty to the Pope in Europe, so there would be no objection to such an undertaking. In case of such an establishment the subjects of the Pope would of course not be required to serve in the Austrian army.

In a sermon delivered at St. James' Cathedral, Seattle, Wash., Bishop J. P. Carrol, of Helena, Mont., stated that one of the causes for the present war was the fact that

the Pope was not admitted to The Hague. He said in part: "The fact is, that the nations of the world feel the need of some moral authority; of someone whose authority extends to all peoples and rises above the rivalries of states; of someone who, having no temporal interests to serve, could speak to the nations on behalf of God and religion with absolute impartiality." (*New World*, March 23, 1917.)

Rome, July 20, 1917: An official of the Vatican has assured a correspondent of the Associated Press of the Pope's deep concern to take part in the peace conference. It is further stated that relations between the Pope and Holland have been broken since the first Conference of The Hague. Holland, in acting upon the suggestion of Italy and Great Britain, failed to invite the Pope to take part in the conference, and this occasioned the break. The relations between the Vatican and the Quirinal, however, have taken such a turn in the last fifteen years that the Pope is now certain that Italy will not object to his entering the Peace Conference. But see what followed:

New World, Chicago, December 14, 1917: According to the dispatch from Rome of December 5th, the Vatican was much stirred by the publication of Russian diplomatic documents which disclosed the terms demanded by Italy of the Allies when she agreed to enter the war. *The Allies agreed "to uphold Italy's opposition to the admission of any diplomatic effort of representatives of the Holy See tending towards the conclusion of peace or the solution of questions relating to the war."* (This agreement eliminated the Pope from the Versailles Peace Conference.)

A *New World* editorial of December 13, 1918, holds out the opinion that the Catholic may yet figure prominently in the peace conference. England is looked upon

as quite friendly, while "France has lost much of her anti-clerical bias." And "it is unconceivable that Foch would be a party to the boycott of the Vatican." The Church was still clamoring for an audience at Versailles.

The various letters and appeals addressed by the Pope to the combatants, as everybody knows, made as little impression as the noise of a lone woodpecker on a dead log in a swamp. Nevertheless, when the Armistice was declared, the Catholic press immediately pronounced the attendance of the Pope at the Peace Conference to be a paramount issue. Omit the Pope from the invitations? Perish the thought! November 30, 1918 *The Tablet* (R. C.) of Brooklyn, N. Y., had a two-column article: "Why the Papacy must be Represented at Peace Table." It was argued that

"if admitted to the council of the powers aiming to readjust the world on a basis of justice, the Vatican would unquestionably be a 'force for righteousness' in the great decisions to be taken. As in times past, it was the Roman Pontiff who rallied Christendom to the crusades, who saved Europe from the menace of Turkish invasion, who acted as peacemaker between kings and nations, so to-day, it is safe to presume, the Pope would probably prove himself the uncompromising champion of right and justice, and his influence would unstintingly support the humane and sound principles of international policy laid down by President Wilson."

An editorial in the *New World*, December 6, 1918, comments on the situation created by the secret agreement of Great Britain, France and Italy, which maintained that the Pope shall not sit at the peace conference. The reality of such a secret treaty was at this time officially admitted in the British Parliament. However, the agitation continued.

The argument of a Paulist Father, lecturing to Protestants, was: "Are the delegates to the Peace Conference leaving the Pope out because he might dominate the conference if they let him in? If he is big enough to

dominate the conference, isn't he too big to be left out of the conference?"

Cardinal O'Connell immediately after the Armistice pointed out that Americans should welcome the presence of the Pope at the Peace Table. He declared that the 14 peace points of President Wilson show little practical divergence from those offered by the Pope. He stated that the Pope's terms are "in reality practically identical with those which were finally proposed by the Allies," and that "because of the courtesy with which President Wilson answered the Pope's peace message, God strengthened Mr. Wilson's powers, moral and physical, and aided America's armies."

"Now the Powers of the world are soon to gather to arrange the terms of peace," he said. "Surely in that gathering the Pope will have a hearing and a rightful place."

When there seemed to be prospect of obtaining for the Vatican a chair at the Conference, the purposes of the propaganda found clearer expression. It developed that the Pope would like to have a little money matter ironed out that had become badly wrinkled for the last forty-eight years, — the accounts due him from the Italian government since he lost his temporal power in 1870. In fact, the Conference might agree to give the Pope a little territory. For one thing the Pope complained that he had no privacy for his telegraph and cable messages. The Vatican wanted to have its own telegraph system so that it might communicate with its nuncios and with foreign governments without using the regular Italian wires and offices. The comment of the *Northwestern Lutheran* was: "It would be an embarrassment for any other Christian church of which we know, to have such a private telegraph system. Any messages that we have

to submit, for example, in the interest of the church might be cried from the housetops without endangering the welfare of sender or recipient. And we believe that there can be no secret for a true church."

New World, Chicago, January 10, 1919: A dispatch from Rome says that the Pope will submit the Roman question to the peace conference. "Encouraging conciliatory approaches have already been made toward the Italian government." His plan provides that the three million lire (about \$600,000) annuity which Italy has accorded to the Vatican since 1870 shall be used for the purchase of a strip of land, so that the Pope may have an outlet to the sea. His Holiness will also ask the Italian government to relinquish its right to approve the appointment of Italian Bishops. * * * Msgr. Ceretti who was appointed to carry the Holy Father's greetings to Cardinal Gibbons will remain in London to greet President Wilson on his arrival in Europe.

The Tablet (R. C.), Brooklyn, November 30, 1918: An article from the Catholic War News Service counts up ten distinct gains for the Catholic Church that came about through the Allied Victory. The summarized points are: 1) The essential aims of the Papal Peace Note of 1917 have been realized, i. e., international justice, etc. This works toward an international religion — the Catholic. 2) The freedom, integrity and prosperity of Great Britain and United States secured for the rest of the twentieth century; this allows Catholics to work freely. 3) Prussian Kultur stamped out; otherwise the Catholic Church would have had to wage a battle against it. 4) The Polish State will make an independent Catholic European power of at least 20 million Catholics. 5) Czaristic Russia knocked out, and the democratic Russia will offer religious freedom to the Catholics. 6) Bel-

gium remains free instead of becoming a vassal of Prussia; this insures Catholic intellectual leadership on the part of the University of Louvain, which is the leading Catholic university of the world. 7) The Slavs of the Austrian Empire will advance the cause of the church since they enjoy freedom. 8) The Syrians and the "holy places" freed from the tyranny of the Turks. 9) Latin Jacobinism will be seriously undermined by the patriotic spirit of the priests in France, Italy and Portugal. 10) The English-speaking Protestants of America were allied with France, Italy, Belgium and Portugal, all of which are claimed to be 95% Catholic, and they fought for liberty in Catholic lands from Ostend to Venice. — Over and against these ten gains the Catholics seem to harbor fear that their churches, seminaries, and monasteries in Alsace-Lorraine may be seized by the French government. The second danger is that Italy will not be represented at the peace conference, since Italy is afraid of an international consideration of the Roman question. The Catholics who contributed the majority of soldiers in the Allied forces should not cease to agitate for international religious freedom, and thus close the era of "religious persecution."

Well, the pope was not invited to the peace conference.

When the peace was concluded, the question of the admission of the Holy See into the League of Nations was immediately agitated by high ecclesiastics. A Louvain professor said: "It is not admissible to reduce the problem to a quarrel of words. If you wish to give the Society of Nations a chance of success you should not deprive it of the effective aid of the first moral Power in the world."

The interest which the hierarchy has in the League of Nations was set forth in 1920 by Senator Sherman of

Illinois, who gave a warning that the League of Nations may end the separation of Church and State and bring the civilized world under the dominance of the Vatican. The Senator said:—

“From an early age the occupants of the Vatican have believed in the inherent right of papal authority to administer civil government, and I fail to find recorded in the course of papal claims of later dates any renunciation or disavowal of the doctrine.

“Of the original 32 nations signatory to the proposed league, 28 are Christian; 17 are Catholic nations, and 11 are Protestant.

“The sway over these people, their implicit faith in the infallibility of the head of this great religious organization, is supreme. I cheerfully bear witness to its steady opposition to a socialistic state, disorder, and Bolshevism. But the head of the Church proclaims and teaches his infallibility.

“Shall the United States commit itself to the mercy of a power from which our ancestors delivered us?

“The Vatican is a most earnest advocate of the covenant of the League of Nations. On March 16, 1919, President Wilson conferred with the Vatican at Rome. The Pope among other things said, referring to the League of Nations: ‘President Wilson put the matter so clearly that my doubts began to melt, and before our interview closed, I agreed with him on the main outlines of his plan.’”

Then adds the Senator ironically: “Miraculous conversion of the deep traditional wisdom of the Holy See!”

As recently as March 11, 1921, the *New World* of Chicago (Catholic) brought an inspired message from Geneva, dated February 25, to this effect:—

“The *Courier de Geneve* of February 5, 1921, publishes a letter sent last December by the Nuncio at Berne to the President of the Swiss Confederation with regard to the intervention of the League of Nations in favor of the Christians of Cilicia. The paper sees in this step an act of official recognition and approval of the League of Nations by the Holy See, and believes that this attitude of Benedict XV will be an encouragement to all Catholics to give it their support.

"The paper regrets that the Holy See was not invited at the very beginning to form part of the League of Nations and that it had no representative there, and expresses the hope that the heads of the League finally will realize the error committed in excluding from the new organization an authority which enjoys such universal consideration and veneration as the Pope."

Dr. Jaeger of Bethel in the Bielefelder weekly *Licht und Leben* has uttered some prognostications on this point which are worthy of our attention. The Evangelical house of Hohenzollern, Dr. Jaeger reminds us, has been excluded by the League from the throne of Germany, and this exclusion is to be a permanent one. On the other hand, nothing is said in the treaty which would prevent the Catholic house of Hapsburg from mounting that throne, or the throne of a Germany united with Austria. Dr. Jaeger then continues:—

"A Catholic Germany under Hapsburg rule would constitute a nucleus for a Europe constituted on new lines. In the East there would be the State of Greater Poland, consisting of Posen, West Prussia, East Prussia, Lithuania, White Russia, and Galicia. This Greater Poland is to be ruled by another Hapsburger, Archduke Stephen. Its actual ruler would, of course, be the (Polish) Jesuit General, Ledochowsky. There is even now a movement looking to the reestablishment of the old Austrian monarchy. The *Petrusblätter* and *Koelnische Volkszeitung* have suggested that Lower Austria with Vienna would be the economic nucleus for a union of the Danube countries, i. e., of Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Roumania, and the Croat-Slovenian state. The population of this new bloc would be preponderatingly Catholic, Roumania at least under a Catholic dynasty. This Donaubund, too, is to have its Hapsburgian head, at Vienna. In France a restoration of diplomatic relations with the Vatican is hoped for. The great French generals, Foch, Joffre, Castelnau, have received their training in Jesuit schools. The house of Bourbon is closely related to Hapsburg, Empress Zita being herself a Bourbon. There is here the possibility of a Catholic monarchy of the West. Belgium is thoroughly clerical, so far as it is not socialistic. A Catholic restoration in France would inevitably result in a similar change in Italy. In Spain there is even now a Hapsburger scion

on the throne. A United States of Europe under papal dominion, that is the possibility which the League of Nations convention in Switzerland has revealed to us. But the papal aspirations are not limited to a European league. Beyond the seas, in South and Central America, a complex of states, Spanish-Portuguese in language, Catholic in religion, is rapidly coming to the front. Through papal mediation, the leading states, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, have formed the so-called ABC union. Papal diplomacy is now endeavoring to extend this organization so as to include all South American states, and this solid bloc, the so-called Latin Union, which will extend to the southern boundaries of the North American states, will not fail to maintain some kind of organic relation to the European. From South America the threads run over to Japan, and quite recently the Vatican has greatly strengthened its relations to the Near East, — relations which may exercise a deciding influence in a coming conflict of the Catholic League with the Anglo-Saxon world: World-wide, bold schemes, maintained through every change and accident, and approaching their realization! Will the Anglo-Saxon nations succeed in opposing them? Will a world-wide revolution bring them to ruin? God knows. His will be the decision."

The *Freikirche*, from which we have translated Dr. Jaeger's paragraph, adds the comment: "These prognostications are, it is true, based only on supposition. But, for all that, they must not be dismissed by a wave of the hand. The Pope is pursuing his plans with iron will and unremitting persistence. And he has his obedient servants in every part of the world — more than two hundred million."

I shall now submit from the war-time press dispatches, arranged chronologically and by countries, and taken mostly from American Catholic journals, the record of papal propaganda during the war. My space does not permit more than a brief sketch of the feverish activity which emanated from the Vatican, all in the direction of the recognition of temporal power, and of the response which this activity found among the nations.

Beginning with the

United States, I find the following in a *Kansas City Star* dispatch, dated New York, December 3, 1918. Some will find it merely amusing, others will note a piece of particularly skilfull propaganda:

"Louis Ceres, a chef from the Hotel Biltmore, with a staff of twenty-five for the kitchen on the transport, went on board the George Washington yesterday to get things ready. The chef and three of the head waiters were sworn in as chief petty officers in the United States Navy for the voyage. Ceres who has had experience in all the great cities in Europe, will prepare only the simplest dishes for President Wilson and his party on the voyage." So far, so good, very good, indeed; though *only* the *simplest* dishes are to be the result of the combined efforts of the 25. But here is the point:

"Mrs. Anna Hamilton of Limerick, Ireland, will serve President and Mrs. Wilson as a representative of the Knights of Columbus during the voyage to and from France. Mrs. Hamilton has been assigned by Commander Perkins to suite 66, the Wilson suite, on the boat. She will wear the chevrons of the K. of C. while ministering to the President and Mrs. Wilson." (How very charming, indeed!) "Mrs. Hamilton has seen service at the front as a nurse and has been in three submarine attacks since the outbreak of the war. Mrs. Annie Glasscott, Mrs. Mary Simpson and Mrs. Vera Stuart will attend upon others of the presidential party. They will also wear the K. of C. overseas insignia."

Referring to the advantage which the United States gained in the regulation of the property rights of the monastic orders on the Philipines, through the action of Mr. Taft as special representative in the Vatican, the Catholic press agents pointed out that the rights of neutral America would best be protected through a diplomatic

representative at the Papal court. Reference was also made to the fact that forty years ago the United States did have an ambassador to the Papal court. The *Catholic Bulletin* said March 21, 1918, that under seven different presidents our country had been represented at the Vatican and it continued:

“‘Already there is a demand that his diplomatic rights shall be restored where they have been slighted, and that direct communication with the Vatican be re-established by those governments where for some years it has been broken off. Direct diplomatic intercourse between the United States and the Pope is neither novel nor unprecedented in our history.’”

The *New World* said October 1, 1919, that a majority of the countries have an ambassador ever ready to listen to the Pope and that “in other instances his delegates approach the rulers as Msgr. Cerritti would our president in Paris. It is then that the interests of the Church, which are those of the world, are discussed.”

A special dispatch from Washington, September 2, 1915, reports that Cardinal Gibbons conferred with the president for nearly half an hour upon his arrival in Washington on September 2nd. He submitted to the president a message which he had received directly from the Vatican. The Cardinal also went over to the state department and discussed peace with Secretary of State Lansing. The contents of the message could not be ascertained; for the Cardinal said: “It is true that the Pope gave me a message for President Wilson and I have delivered it, but I cannot discuss it for publication.”

In connection with the coming of Cardinal Daugherty to the city of Philadelphia, about this time, sufficient influence was exerted to secure him a public ovation and reception by civil authority. A leading Protestant

clergyman would never have sought and never have received such demonstration from civil authorities.

The present writer said in 1921 (*Theological Monthly*, p. 230):

"Every encroachment of the Roman hierarchy in this country upon the forbidden ground of politics has had but one ulterior aim — the recognition of the Pope as a temporal ruler. Stone has been laid upon stone in the arch, of which a papal legation at Washington is to be the keystone. And it seems as if the present is deemed the acceptable time. A 'closer union' between this Government and the head of the 'great body of Catholicism' is being advocated. National interests are pleaded for American representation at the Vatican. President Harding has been 'sounded.' Mr. Egan, ex-minister of the United States to Denmark, 'may be America's first minister to the Vatican.' We are quoting from Associated Press dispatches. Catholic expressions, both in the official press and from the public rostrum, pointing out the advantages which will accrue to America from such an arrangement, have multiplied of late. Much is made of England's representation at Rome, as evidence that even its 'Protestant bias' could not prevent Great Britain from recognizing the fact that 'the Vatican is the world's greatest religious and moral influence.' (*America*, a Jesuit weekly.) The National Catholic Welfare Council has sent out a dispatch bearing on the possibility of Washington's being the meeting-place of an international congress which is to discuss an 'association of nations.' Accepting this report as true, the dispatch says:—

'From this point of view the position of the Pope is one of commanding importance, and his approval of an association of nations which is to direct by moral rather than military force international activities would have great weight. And if the United States is to take the lead in the formulation of the broad

general principles upon which the proposed association of nations is to be founded, the assumption is that exchanges of views between the President and the Vatican would be facilitated by the appointment of an American Minister to the Holy See without in any way transgressing upon the American idea of complete separation of Church and State. The action of France has already pointed the way.'

"The Apostolic Delegate himself, John Bonzano, in a speech delivered at Quigley Preparatory Seminary, Chicago, last year, said:—

'And not the multitudes only are looking to the Pope for assistance; the rulers of the earth are beginning to see that without his aid they are powerless in face of the present situation. They are at last giving heed to the call of the Psalmist: "Et nunc, reges, intelligite; erudimini, qui judicatis terram."

'The heads of the new nations — those which have come into existence through the great upheaval — are seeking to establish relations with the Holy See. For even at the birth of their national organization they are wise enough to understand that they need the influence of the Holy Father if they are to live and prosper.

'But the older nations also are coming to see the light; they have learned through the bitter experience of war what they had forgotten in the pleasant days of peace. They acknowledge that there can be no thorough restoration of order and no permanent security of peace except through the cooperation of him who represents on earth the Prince of Peace.'

"In this way the Catholic masses are prepared to give, when the opportune moment comes, the weight of their numbers to the demand that diplomatic relations be established between the White House and the Vatican."

England. Late in the first year of the war, 1914, Sir Henry Howard, at one time an attache of the British legation in Washington, D. C., was assigned to a position as official envoy of Great Britain at the Vatican court. This was the first representative of the British government sent to the Holy See since the days of Henry VIII. The *Brooklyn Eagle* pointed out the fact

that Germany and Austria both have an envoy, and therefore also "Great Britain seeks to have her views represented and understood." Italy, too, still regards the Pope as a "temporal sovereign" and "offers tribute to him, 3,225,000 francs a year, which no Pope has accepted." England has come to recognize the sending of an envoy to the Vatican as a "political necessity."

Rome, January 12, 1915: The interview which the British ambassador to the Holy See had with the Pope was of a "markedly cordial character." It is thought that he will aid in bridging over the breach with France. A storm of protests comes from England's Protestants. The *Churchmen's Union* says it is undoing the work of four hundred years in which English kings have consistently ignored the pretensions of Rome. The Evangelical Alliance demands the instant suppression of the mission, and Rev. Dr. Clifford wishes to know the full significance of the movement. The London Council of Protestant Societies has sent to Premier Asquith a resolution "strongly condemning" the appointment given to Sir Henry Howard as an envoy to the Vatican. The resolutions deny that there is any just precedent for sending an envoy "to congratulate the Pope on his election to the papacy," and further denounce the "secrecy with which this proceeding was planned and the omission of the government to consult parliament." The fact that the Vatican is beginning to consider this "special envoy" a *permanent* minister to the Pope is causing much adverse feeling among the Protestants.

New World, Chicago, August 25, 1916: Sir Henry Howard resigns his diplomatic post and will leave Rome. Count de Salis will be his successor. The latter is Count of the Holy Roman Empire. Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, visited the British fleet and

"pontificated at Mass on board one of the battleships — the first time that an English cardinal has done so since the Reformation."

New World, October 13, 1916: Upon the request of Cardinal Bourne England and the British empire (!!) was consecrated to the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary at the feast of the Lady of Sorrows. The "Stabat Mater" was sung in all the churches, followed by three "Hail Marys" and the invocation "Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary, pray for us," which was offered before the Blessed Sacrament was exposed.

New World, October 27, 1916: The steady growth of Catholicism in England is well illustrated in a letter by Bishop Amigo of Southwark. He states that he has funds in hand, by legacies and donations, to supply no fewer than six new Catholic churches in the diocese. Besides this a jubilee gift of \$500,000 has been raised to extinguish all debts on existing missions. New churches will be erected at six places.

New World, September 22, 1916: Sir William Henry Dunn is to be Lord Mayor of London. He is a strong Catholic, will assume authority some time in November, and will not attend any of the official Protestant services usually frequented by Lord Mayors. One of Sir William Dunn's first official acts will be to attend Mass at Westminster Cathedral in state. He will be accompanied by his chaplain, a priest.

New World, January 5, 1917: The new English Ambassador to the Vatican, Count Francis De Salis is received by the Pope with great ceremony. Immediately after all the members of the legation had been presented Pope Benedict took De Salis into his private library, where they remained for some time in private conversation.

New World, November 30, 1917: A Catholic writer comments on Protestants demanding that the Pope excommunicate the enemies of England. He says that this is not "in keeping with the attitude taken by England in solemnly binding itself by the London pact that the Pope would be excluded from any peace conclave at the end of the war." He laments that two prominent facts are commonly overlooked: First, that the Pope is the common father of all Christendom, and secondly, that "*the Pope is the recognized head of an actual government,*" and the majority of Christian nations acknowledge his dominion.

New World, June 28, 1918: Among the interesting events taking place at the Vatican was a visit paid the Pope by the Prince of Wales on May 26th. The young prince was received by the Holy See with great ceremony and with full sovereign honors. Most remarkable of all is the fact that the Vatican returned the visit on the same afternoon, with another big display of courtesy, etc., etc. It seems that the prince visited about all the notable secretaries and Cardinals at the Vatican. Italian Catholics are quite boastful in saying that no such remarkable scene has ever been witnessed at the Vatican since the days of the Reformation. Speculation is even set forth that the young prince might want to take an Italian bride and thus all difficulties between England and the Pope could be smoothed away by a Catholic Queen for England.

France. Strong evidence is brought out in a London report of January 2, 1915, that France will soon establish diplomatic relations to the Vatican similar to those established by England. "Cardinal Gasparri recently gave an audience to a French journalist in which he emphasized the complete neutrality of the Holy See

in the present struggle. In addition to this, however, the French government has appointed Monsignor Duchesne, who lives in Rome, as its 'Charge d'Affaires' to discuss matters with the Cardinal Secretary of State." (It never went beyond this form of representation.)

Benedict XV wrote the following with his own hand under his portrait which was sent to the officials of a confederation of the youths of France: "We pray that the benevolent God may pour out the grace of his election upon the Catholic youth of France, because we place our highest hopes for the future in this confederation of this noble and magnanimous people, which we always regard as the oldest daughter of the Church." From the beginning the new Pope is said to have felt a deep love for France. Intimation is made that some day the rally-cry "*Save Rome and France!*" may again be heard.

According to a dispatch from Paris, July 26, 1916, the Holy Father has extended his benediction to some fifteen thousand pilgrims from all parts of France who attended the National pilgrimage to Pontmain. It was a "national demonstration for victory and peace" under the direction of the Bishop of Laval, and was to commemorate the apparition of Pontmain which occurred on January 17, 1871. On that evening the Blessed Virgin, crowned with stars, appeared to a group of children as they were going home, talking of the misfortunes of their country, for which they had been praying. She promised if they would keep on praying there would be a speedy deliverance of France. At this 1916 celebration the Pope willingly consented "to give one of the Bishops present the privilege of bestowing the apostolic benediction on the crowd."

The *New World*, Chicago, September 15, 1916, brings the announcement the blessed Joan of Arc is to be canonized.

That the Holy See would be very glad to see diplomatic relations restored between it and France was officially stated by Cardinal Gasparri, according to a *New World* report on September 8, 1916. The prospects for such diplomatic relations "are improving." While of course, the Pope is "rigidly impartial," his secretary says that he has a *special benevolence* for the Catholic nations which have *suffered* the most, — France, Poland, and Belgium. (Can you beat this for diplomacy?!)

Cardinal Gasparri's recent invitation to France for a renewal of diplomatic relations with the Holy See is bitterly denounced by Socialists. A French prelate, however, believes that the "majority of the people in France are in favor of having an ambassador to the Vatican when the war is over." (*New World*, September 15, 1916.)

Three more French prelates are to be added to the membership of the Sacred College, making eight French cardinals, according to a report in the *New World*, December 8, 1916. France is said to be joyful over the event. Outside of Italy, France has now proportionately more cardinals than any other nation; Spain has five, Austria five, and France beats either by three.

The *New World*, June 28, 1918, comments on a petition which is to be presented to the Chamber of Deputies by the Women's Society of Jeanne d'Arc. The petition has over 200,000 signatures, including Protestants, Jews, and freethinkers, and asks that diplomatic relations be renewed with the Holy See. It has a good deal of parliamentary support, and some believe that if it were placed before the chamber by the President as a "fait accompli" there would not be a single protest. Senator Debrerre, Grand Master of the Freemasons, holds that the new mission to the Vatican should not be combated.

One of the most weighty arguments in the petition's favor is that they will sooner or later have to rely on the Pope to nominate new bishops for the Alsace Lorraine territory where the German bishops have been driven out. And therefore "it is certainly good policy not to wait till the last moment before taking the necessary action."

A dispatch in the *New World* of September 6, 1918, relates an additional and unexpected plea for the resumption of diplomatic relations between France and the Vatican. The plea comes in the form of a book by M. de Monzie, a leading Radical and Freemason, who is an under-secretary of the Painleve Cabinet. He dwells upon the advantage France would receive from such diplomatic relations; and his book "has aroused a great deal of interest" in France, Italy, and Germany among both Catholics and non-Catholics.

Germany. *New World*, April 27, 1917. Rome, April 24, 1917: "Mgr. Pacelli has been appointed Nuncio to Bavaria. He resides at Munich and is the diplomatic representative to the German Empire. The remaining laws against the Jesuits have been repealed."

The Vatican has had a nuncio in Munich since 1785. A second nunciature was established at Berlin in 1920. A clear-visioned writer in the *Reichsbote* (Dr. W. Dreising) makes this comment (June 18, 1921):—

"And what does this nuncio signify? In plain words, the nunciature means an absolute supervision (Beaufsichtigung) of Germany by Rome. No political measures that even remotely affect the interests of Catholics will hereafter be taken without the *placet* of the Pope. Of course, Rome is too shrewd to give and withhold publicly its opinions, but the fact remains as stated. And the worst of it is that the Roman censorship will insensibly

be extended to German liberty, German law, German scholarship, while the Evangelical Church will be reduced to the niveau of a sect. Incredible though it may seem, I have received from Evangelical clergymen, to whom I expressed these fears, the answer: 'The nuncio, — oh, we shall get rid of him again!' Really? Oh, how little these people know Rome! What rivers of blood flowed during the Thirty Years' War that we might get rid of Rome, — and in vain. No, our poor fatherland will never again be delivered from the nuncio and the terrible hand of Rome. We lost the World War May 15" (the date of the nuncio's appointment to Berlin). "Everything imposed upon us by the Entente can be restored, repaired, though it take a century; but the establishment of the nunciature can never be redeemed."

As a matter of fact, these papal legations in Protestant countries have, since the Reformation, been termed Missionary Nunciatures, their object being the restoration of Roman ascendancy. In Bohemia and Poland this work was very thoroughly done, and the establishment of the office in Munich was the reply of the Vatican to the attempts made by Bishop Hontheim of Treves and of the Congress of Ems to establish a national Catholic Church for Germany.

Italy. *New World*, October 6, 1916, Rome, October 3, 1916: The Holy Father has lodged a protest against the Italian Government because the latter has seized the Palazzo di Venezia which is the residence of the Austrian ambassador to the Holy See. Such a seizure is claimed to be in violation to the diplomatic representation which Italy guarantees to the Holy See by the law of May, 1871. It is pointed out that the ambassador is absent only temporarily, and that he may return at any time.

New World, April 27, 1917. Rome, March 27, 1917: According to this dispatch, the Holy Father failed to make any political reference in a recent Sacred Consistory, that had been previously predicted by the Italian paper *Osservatore Romano*. Cardinal Bourne left Rome for Paray-le-Monial, where he will place the British flag on the altar of the Sacred Heart. The offering of the Belgian flag will be renewed; besides this the Italian, French, Roumanian, Russian, Japanese, and Serbian flags will be placed on the same altar.

New World, June 29, 1917: Monsignor Gerlach and five Italians tried by the military court have all been found guilty of high treason and espionage. Gerlach is sentenced to life imprisonment at hard labor; one of the Italians, Pomarici, to be shot in the back; and the other four received sentences of imprisonment. Indignation expressed at Gerlach's betrayal of the generous trust the Pope had placed in him in allowing him to remain in the Vatican after all Germans and Austrians had left Italy. "*Holy See is not implicated by the case.*"

Spain. The *New World* of March 3, 1916 reports that a new ambassador has been sent to the Vatican by Spain, Senor Calbeton. Three years before, strained relations were brought to light when the Spanish ambassador was suddenly withdrawn. The difficulty arose over an effort on the part of Senor Canalejas to misinterpret and even alter the concordat between the Holy See without reference to the other power as was required by the terms of the concordat. Senor Calbeton came to Rome to express "the filial affection of His Catholic Majesty for the Holy Father." The latter replied in "kindly terms."

Russia. *New World*, October 5, 1917: Hopes of "a new era for the Catholics" of Russia have been revived by the appointment of M. Lissakovsky as minister to the Holy See. The new democratic government promises "that all Russians shall henceforth enjoy complete liberty of conscience and of worship." The Holy Synod which is anti-Catholic has been antagonized thereby. The Vatican hopes to fill the vacant see of Mohilev, and the Church, being free, looks forward to rapid and solid progress.

New World, October 12, 1917: Lissakovsky is given a cordial welcome at the Vatican. The fact that Bishop De Ropp of Vilna has been promoted to be Archbishop of Mohilev is cited as a proof of Russia's sincerity in her promise to give complete freedom to the Catholic Church.

New World, October 26, 1917: The Russian minister to the Holy See, M. Lissakovsky, "has communicated to the Papal Secretary of State the text of the new Russian law regarding the Catholic Church." "In reference to ecclesiastical jurisdiction and such affairs as the erection and division of dioceses, appointments of Bishops, of chapters, rectors, professors in seminaries and other clerical officials, and the building of churches, the Church authorities enjoy full liberty." They must, however, inform the government representatives of such transactions. "The Holy See is to appoint Archbishops and Bishops by agreement with the government. The Church enjoys the right to establish its own schools, to ensure the teaching of the catechism and to appoint teachers in the civil schools. Full freedom is granted to religious associations and monastic orders, including the Jesuits. The last two paragraphs of the law explicitly state that, liberty of conscience having been established

by a special law, no obstacle now exists to conversions to the Roman Catholic Church." Also all censoring of the 'Acta Apostolicae Sedis,' is now definitely abolished. A commission was appointed by the Pope for the interpretation of the canon law.

New World, October 26, 1917: The Council of the Russian Church met at Moscow and issued an encyclical to be read on Sunday in all Russian churches. The Council has in view to re-establish the patriarchate abolished by Peter the Great, and to reunite the dissenting sects produced in the Orthodox Church since that suppression.

Poland. *New World*, November 24, 1916: Gratification was caused in the Vatican by the news of the "establishment of a revived Kingdom of Poland by Emperor William of Germany and Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria." "No action, however, will be taken by the Pope until after the close of the war." When Paderewski was made premier of Poland, the Catholic press announced that he was developing a program which would make the Roman Catholic Church the established (state) church of the new republic.

The success of the Vatican politics in Poland was frequently set forth in Roman Catholic cable letters, the good news culminating in a dispatch of February 6 (1921), which stated that the Polish diet had adopted on that date a resolution prescribing for the Polish president two qualifications — he must be a native of Poland, and he must be Roman Catholic. In a letter to the *Lutheran* (Philadelphia), Rev. Dr. J. A. Morehead, commissioner of the National Lutheran Council in Europe, wrote (May 5, 1921) :—

"When Poland came to adopt a constitution, articles were proposed which indicate the policy of the Vatican where it has the power. We go into details concerning the situation in order

to set before our readers in specific form the present-day Roman doctrine of temporal supremacy. In America our religious liberty would not last long if an opportunity to restrict its present privileges is given.

"In the constitution of the Polish state — heretofore merely a project — the two articles referring to the Church read as follows: 'Art. 117. The Roman Catholic Church, to which the majority of the population of Poland belongs, takes the first place. She rules by her own laws. The relation between this Church and the state is consolidated by a Concordat with the Pope. Art. 118. The question of the relation between the other confessions and the state will be settled by a statute law after hearing the suggestions of the different delegates.'

"The leader of the Roman Catholic party is a papal fanatic, who gives his views of the Protestant churches as follows: 'The Protestant "so-called" churches are "church unions," which are compelled to submit their statutes to the minister for registration. The Roman Catholic Church alone is a Church in the full sense of the word, and has its own legislation.'

Bulgaria. Although the ruler of Bulgaria is not yet reconciled with the Holy Father, a writer in the *New World*, August 30, 1918, is eagerly looking forward to the time when he and the entire Bulgarian "Schismatic" church will again be received and diplomatic relations granted by the Holy See. "One by one the nations are gathering their representatives in the halls of the Vatican: Portugal has come back, and Msgr. Locatelli, who has heretofore been stationed in Belgium, will be sent as a representative from the Pope. Again, France is Catholic as far as her people are concerned; but she is still very obstinate."

Switzerland. July 16, 1915. The Papal representative, Mgr. Francesco Selvaggiani Marchetti, has been received by the President of the Confederation in Berne. Unlike Great Britain and Holland, Switzerland does not accept the representation in a full official capacity. The envoy's duty will be to supervise the work of ministering

to the twenty thousand sick prisoners (? !)) of which Switzerland has agreed to take care. Correspondence for the Holy Father is not interfered with by the Italian Government; Austria and Germany communicate with the Vatican through Switzerland.

Holland. Holland was also persuaded to send an envoy to the Pope.

"This shows how industriously the friends of the pope are working, and how the old thirst for political power still remains with Romanism. It is difficult to understand the motive and seduction which causes these Protestant nations to take this step. The importance of the pope becomes only the more humiliatingly apparent with each step of this kind. Great Britain, for some reason, took this step at the beginning of the war, and she now realizes that it has little profit for her. She has neither received high treatment at the Vatican, nor has papal Ireland become any more loving or loyal to her. All she can claim to have gained is that she has become undecided in some important matters. Holland is very likely to learn a like lesson, but she may pay a high price or a low humiliation for it." (*The Presbyterian.*)

Portugal. *New World*, March 7, 1919: A Portuguese envoy is now at the Vatican. Pope Benedict is gratified that diplomatic relations are again restored. Mgr. Locatelli, Papal Nuncio to Portugal, will soon leave for Lisbon to take up his duties.

Albania. In 1918 a new Papal committee ("congregation") for the Oriental Church was appointed by the Pope. The purpose of the committee was to gain influence in the Greek (Russian) Orthodox Church, especially by preparing young clerics for entry into the Oriental Institute to study for the priesthood. Especially Albanians of the Greek rite were to be the object of this mission.

Palestine. Since Palestine has been freed from Turkish rule Mgr. Casmassi has been appointed Assistant Bishop in Rome, and appointment was also made to Mgr.

Barlassina as Titular-Bishop of Capernaum. The Patriarchate comprises the whole of Palestine. (November 18, 1918.)

Associated Press, Rome, March 20: The Holy Father received a delegation of the clergy of the Orient and said in part: "The Roman pontiff has always been a friend of the Oriental church and has reposed great hopes in it." * * * He "has turned with deep affection to the Orient, which has been all the more intense because of the uncertainty of the fate of the distant sons of the church. * * * I transmit my thought to those present, and trust that all wish that oriental Christendom should be united by close friendship and filial love to the apostolic see." He then bestowed the apostolic blessing on all present.

Japan. *Chicago Tribune*, February 7, 1918: The special delegate from the Vatican, Mgr. Petrelli, while "delivering Pope Benedict's coronation congratulations to Emperor Yoshihito," also made further inquiries "relative to the reception of a possible peace proposal from the vatican." The "foreign office denies that Mgr. Petrelli has discussed subjects of a political nature with Japanese statesmen." The envoy declines to comment on the rumors of peace which his visit occasioned.

On February 2 "a banquet was given in the Imperial Palace in which many members of the imperial family, and most of the ministers of the cabinet" participated. The Emperor had a "very animated conversation with the envoy" and decorated him with the "Morningsun Order" of the first class.

New World, April 2, 1918: An unusual amount of publicity was given the Papal envoy, Petrelli, and "everywhere the highest officials of the province and the city received him." The word of the Council of Trent verified: "Let us all be convinced that the Church will gain in

esteem and influence according to the endeavor of each one to do his duty." One of the influential papers of Japan comments thus: "May the Catholic Church, which, as we know, is the foundress of western civilization, succeed in leading the religious movement in Japan into the proper channels."

China. After arrangements were made by the Vicar of Christ to exchange diplomats also with the Chinese Republic, France protested, because this was contrary to her treaty of 1858 which guaranteed her the responsibility of safeguarding the interests of Roman Catholics in China. (From this action it is apparent that France for once realized the danger of allowing Roman representatives to act as go-betweens in playing one power or group of powers against the other, which would result in a measure with Roman Church's retaining a balance of political power.) The *New World* of August 30, 1918, in commenting on the diverging views between France and the Holy See with regard to a Roman delegate in Peking quotes the *Osservatore Romano* thus: "The Nuncio to China will have the functions of an Apostolic Delegate, no more and no less." It tries to establish the idea that his function will be "purely spiritual" and that such a nunciature could not possibly harm France but would rather be an aid to the French minister. *New World*, September 6, 1918: The Holy See has clearly explained that France's treaty of Tientsin will not be interfered with in the slightest degree. The establishment of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and China "rests entirely with the latter." However, according to the *New World* of September 20, 1918, France still retained her misgivings, and persuaded China "not to receive a Papal Nuncio while the war lasts."

Globe Democrat, St. Louis, Mo., October 21, 1918: The French Minister to China immediately lodged a protest "upon hearing that the Papal Delegate to the Philippines, Mgr. Petrelli, had been appointed Papal Nuncio to China." Petrelli is a personal friend of Admiral Hintze, the late German Minister to China and now German Foreign Secretary, and thus it was charged to be "against the spirit of the alliance between China and the Entente nations." The *Lutheran Standard*, March 1, 1919, quotes from *Missionary Review of the World*: "With every disposition to be fair, one cannot view without concern this repetition of the Papacy's effort to take part in the political life of China. * * * The papal system is so essentially autocratic that an open and public statement of aims, such as the representative of a republic might make to his constituents, is for a papal representative impracticable."

Turkey. A report from Rome, January 2, 1915, announced the arrival of an Apostolic Delegate in Constantinople, and that he had been received by the Sultan. The Turkish authorities who formerly had refused to allow the monks to leave the country, withdrew their objection. The Italian government put in a very strong protest against keeping them there. Another report over London of January 2, 1915, confirms the above and states that this is "the first time a Sultan of Turkey has received an Apostolic Delegate without the intervention of the French embassy." His name is Monsignor Dolci; he was received almost immediately by the Sultan, and presented to the latter an autograph letter from the Holy Father.

The Unspeakable Turk and the Holy Father — true, politics makes strange bed-fellows!

And possibly not so strange after all.

The Three Pillars.

5. The Three Pillars.

It is a bold charge to bring against Romanism that it is anti-American, root and branch. But the charge is one that is picked up from documents which come to us from the Vatican itself. The Roman pontiff is responsible for the charge. In his encyclicals he has denounced every fundamental principle of our republic, and calls them all heresies. Liberty of conscience, liberty of the press, and liberty of speech, these are American principles; but in his encyclicals the Roman See has anathematized them not once but many times.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides for liberty of worship. It provides that the State cannot legislate either to establish, or to prevent the free exercise of any religion. Pope Leo XIII condemns our Constitution on this point. He writes, on pages 149 and 150 of his Encyclical Letters (*Libertas*, June 20, 1888):

"Let us examine that liberty in individuals which is so opposed to the virtue of religion, namely, the liberty of worship, as it is called. This is based upon the principle that every man is free to profess, as he may choose, any religion or none."

Pope Leo then argues that this is an error, that every man is bound to adopt the Roman Catholic belief, concluding his argument against liberty of worship, by condemning it, on page 150, as "no liberty, but its degradation, and the abject submission of the soul to sin."

The *Syllabus* of Pius IX has this:

Prop. LXXIX. *"It is true that the civil liberty of every form of worship, and the full power given to all of*

openly and publicly manifesting whatsoever opinions and thoughts, lead to the more ready corruption of the minds and morals of the people."

Our Constitution says that the police power, or the military power, cannot be used to compel a man, woman, or child, to embrace a creed in which he does not believe. Leo XIII taught that the State should not treat the various religions alike, but should adopt the papal belief, to the exclusion of all others.

*"Justice therefore forbids, and reason itself forbids, the State to be godless; or to adopt a line of action which would end in godlessness — namely, to treat the various religions (as they call them) alike, and to bestow upon them promiscuously equal rights and privileges. Since the profession of ONE religion is necessary in the State, that religion must be professed which alone is true, and which can be recognized without difficulty, especially in Catholic states, because the marks of truth are, as it were, engraven upon it" (p. 150. *Libertas*, ed. Herder p. 37).*

"It is not lawful for the state any more than for the individual, either to disregard all religious duties or to hold in equal favor different kinds of religion." (Immortale Dei, ed. Herder, p. 13.)

"The church indeed deems it unlawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion." (Immortale Dei, ed. Herder, p. 41.)

Note that in the Encyclical treating of Human Liberty, Leo XIII, reminds all the nations "to obey the Church like Christ Himself, under pain of eternal damnation for those who act otherwise." (*Libertas*, ed. Herder, p. 43.)

Have these declarations ever been revoked by the Roman Catholic Church? If so, we have gained no knowledge thereof. All that we have read by Roman Catholic writers was merely an attempt either to justify

these declarations or to take the edge off of them in order to meet attacks from those who maintain that the Romanist, if he be a loyal adherent of his Church, its official teachings and principles, is in irreconcilable conflict with the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Even Cardinal Gibbons, in his book "The Faith of Our Fathers," makes these significant statements, the best he has to offer in vindication of his Church against the charge that it is opposed to civil and religious liberty:

"A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a right conscience and of practicing the form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God (49th edition, 1897, page 264).

"The Church is indeed intolerant in this sense that she must never confound the truth with error; nor can she ever admit that a man is conscientiously free to reject the truth when its claims are convincingly brought home to the mind. Many Protestants seem to be very much disturbed by some such argument as this: Catholics are very ready now to proclaim freedom of conscience because they are in the minority. When they once succeed in getting the upper hand in numbers and power they will destroy this freedom because their faith teaches them to tolerate no doctrine other than the Catholic. It is, therefore, a matter of absolute necessity for us that they should never be allowed to get this advantage.

"Now, in all this there is a great mistake, which comes from not knowing the Catholic doctrine in its fullness. I shall not lay it down myself lest it seem to have been gotten up for the occasion. I shall quote the great theologian Becanus, who taught the doctrine of the schools of Catholic theology at the time when the struggle was hottest between Catholicity and Protestantism. He says that religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it. The ruler may even enter into a contract in order to secure to his subjects this freedom in religious matters, and when once a contract is made it must be observed absolutely in every point, just as every other lawful and honest contract. (Page 268.)"

What else are these obviously mildest declarations of Romanists but a confirmation of the charge that the Roman Catholic Church does not stand for full and perfect religious liberty, as understood by all Americans and defined in our Federal Constitution, that every man shall be free not only to worship God according to the dictates of a "right conscience" and to practice a "religion most in accordance with his duties to God," but according to his conscience and his conception of his duties to God, right or wrong, so long as he is not thereby led to endanger the equal rights and liberties of his neighbor, or to interfere with the free exercise of the Government's power in the equal protection of all citizens?

Is there any comment necessary on the Cardinal's quotation from Becanus to show that it in nowise commits the Roman Catholic Church to the principle of religious liberty, but most clearly decries that principle as an evil to be tolerated only by reason of necessity, "when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it?"

The Lutheran Conference of New York said in 1908, in a letter addressed to President Roosevelt:*

"Are we not, then, compelled to maintain that a loyal Roman Catholic who fully understands the allegiance required of him by the Pope can never sincerely subscribe to the Federal Constitution, or if he does subscribe to it, never can be expected to abide by it, enforce and defend it? Papacy and Vaticanism cannot be separated from the Roman Catholic religion. If any one should entertain an idea that this were possible let him read Cardinal Gibbon's aforequoted book.

"How, then, could we, as firm believers in the principle of complete separation of Church and State, and the liberties based thereon and safeguarded thereby, conscientiously and consistently help to elect to the Presidency a member of the Roman Catholic

* Roosevelt had rebuked as "narrow bigotry" the opposition to Roman Catholic candidates on account of their religion.

Church, so long as that Church does not officially through its Pontiff or Church Council, revoke its diametrically opposed declarations?

"Are the 3,000,000 and more Lutherans of this country, not to speak of the millions of other Protestants who take this position for the reasons stated, to be accused of bigotry or fanaticism because of such, their stand, aye, be denounced as being disloyal American citizens? We protest that it is neither personal feeling nor religious antagonism which determines our attitude in this matter, but solely our disagreement with the Roman Catholic Church on this basic political principle, a disagreement growing out of the rejection and denunciation by the Roman Catholic Church of that very principle which you (Mr. Roosevelt) admonish all faithfully to uphold not only in theory but in practice.

"We do not wish to be understood as though we mean to accuse the bulk of the Roman Catholics of being disloyal American citizens. We sincerely believe a great many do not fully realize the position the hierarchy of their church maintains with reference to the principle in question, especially in view of the outgivings of their teachers in this country, and that if it come to an issue compelling a decision either for the Constitution or the Papal hierarchy, they would decide in favor of the former, upholding the Constitution of the United States. Yet, in determining our attitude in this matter, especially when it comes to electing a man to the highest public office, we must be guided by the official teachings of the recognized authorities of the Roman Catholic Church."

An interesting commentary on the teaching of the popes is the statement of Cardinal Newman, who makes intolerance one of the marks of the Church. "If there be a form of Christianity at this day," he says, "distinguished for its careful organization and its consequent power; if it is spread over the world; if it is conspicuous for zealous maintenance of its own creed; if it is intolerant towards what it considers error; if it is engaged in ceaseless war with all other bodies called Christian; — such a religious communion is not unlike historical Chris-

tianity, as it comes before us at the Nicene era." "The Development of Christian Doctrine," Ch. 6, Sec. 2.

That the "war with all other bodies called Christian" was not waged with purely spiritual weapons is attested by history down to a rather recent date.

That the Romish church is just as intolerant to-day as it was in the Middle Ages is again proved by the treatment to which the Protestant missions in Madagascar were subjected in 1907. We read:

"Notwithstanding its bitter war with Romanism at home, France is doing everything possible to crush out Protestant missions, the first and most successful of all missions in Madagascar. It will be remembered that when France seized that island, imprisoned and exiled its intelligent, educated and devoutly Christian queen, the Paris Evangelical Society assumed responsibility for the missions which the English had established and supported for many years. It was thought that this self-sacrificing move on the part of French Protestants would deprive the government of all pretext for proscription. But those who so believed did not know the bitterness with which the priests could pursue Protestant converts. To this day every obstacle is thrown in the way of Protestant schools in Madagascar, and lately the government has gone so far as to break up the Malagasy Young Men's Christian Association, which has just purchased for itself a home in Antananarivo, the capital. Two thousand Protestant schools have recently been closed under the pretext that the state must assume the entire education of the youth of the colony. But the decrees are in each case so worded that while effective against Protestant schools, they permit the continuance of Romanist schools, the very ones which are ruthlessly crushed out in Paris."

The London Mission Society published some interesting details, from which we take the following:

"On Christmas Day, as the people of Ambohinanambola were in their church, the Catholic bishop appeared, informing the congregation that he was going to conduct the service according to Catholic rites. The minister replied that they were loyal citizens of France, but that the church had been built by Protestants for Protestant services. But the bishop expelled the congregation, and took formal possession of the edifice, in the name of the government and the Catholic Church. If complaints are made in cases of this kind, the Jesuits always declare that perfect liberty of religious opinion exists under French rule, but that the churches must be given to them if a number of inhabitants demand it. Protestant ministers and laymen are continually threatened with imprisonment and death, as enemies of France."

Superintendent Borchgrevink, of the Norwegian missions, reported as follows:

"The adherents of the Jesuits, banded together in companies of 40 to 50 men, terrorize the Lutheran villages, and compel the Protestants to enter their children's names in the list of Jesuit pupils, under the pain of death. Teachers and pupils who remain Protestants are beaten. The Jesuits tell the people that the Government is entirely on the side of the Catholics, though, for appearance sake, the officials do not say so. The Jesuits even boast that General Gallieni is powerless to stop them in their course, as they will have him recalled if he opposes them, and they point to the recall of General Laroche as a precedent."

Freedom of the press and freedom of speech are likewise under the ban of the Roman Catholic Church. In his Encyclical *Libertas*, Leo XIII decreed:

Gregory XVI, in his encyclical letter 'Mirari vos', of date August 15, 1832, inveighed with weighty words against the 'sophisms,' which even at his time were being publicly inculcated; namely, * * * that it is lawful for every one to publish his own views, whatever they may be.
* * *

"We must now consider briefly liberty of speech and liberty of the press. It is hardly necessary to say that there can be no such right as this, if it be not used in moderation, and if it pass beyond the bounds and end of all true liberty. * * * If unbridled license of speech and of writing be granted to all, nothing will remain sacred and inviolate. * * * Wherefore this liberty [of teaching] also, in order that it may deserve the name, must be kept within certain limits, lest the office of teaching be turned with impunity into an instrument of corruption. * * * From what has been said, it follows that it is quite unlawful, to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of worship, as if these were so many rights given by nature to man." (Pp. 123-161.)

In this connection the efforts of Romanists to bring the press of our country under papal control should come in for some passing mention.

According to an article in *The Presbyterian Banner*, Prof. David Schaff tells of propaganda advertisements inserted daily during a season in 1921 in certain of the Pittsburgh papers, paid for by two native Pittsburgh Catholic business men, which magnify the special claims of the Catholic Church. A counter-statement was prepared by Professor Schaff, in favor of Protestantism, and offered to the same papers with pay. But one of these papers refused to print it, even after promising to do so, and the other failed to print it. The only reason

given was that it might start religious controversy and might mean a libel suit. The *Presbyterian* made this comment:

"This kind of thing has gone far enough. Protestantism must assert itself with wisdom and strength, and far enough to let the hierarchy of Rome know that their full religious liberty will be respected and maintained, but any attempt, in secret or openly, to spread propaganda by civil or physical means will be stoutly resisted. The only way to maintain peace is by fair and open means. The Catholic citizens everywhere should understand that their political and civil equality is conceded and their religious control will be resented. If newspapers persist in giving special favor to Romanism, then Protestants should refuse them admittance to their homes and should establish publications which will deal fairly with all as vehicles of public service and discussion. It would be well for the fair-minded Catholics to join in repression of all this forced propaganda."

On Sunday, July 21, 1912, the *San Francisco Examiner* (Hearst), the largest paper in point of circulation on the Pacific coast, devoted a page to the rise of the human kind from ignorance, superstition, bigotry, etc. On the following Saturday, July 27, *The Leader* (Catholic) in an editorial condemned the foregoing article, advising its people to boycott the *Examiner*. On the next Saturday, August 3, *The Leader* is silent, no doubt for the purpose of giving the *Examiner* time to make amends, but the paper did not come through. The next Saturday, August 10, *The Leader* again forces the fight in an editorial headed "Evil Newspapers." The following Saturday, August 17, *The Leader* is silent on the subject, but it knows what is to follow in the *Examiner* the next day (Sunday supplements are prepared ahead). Sunday, August 18, the *Examiner* comes into camp with a full-page, the picture of Pope Pius, the tiara, and all that goes with it.

The almost complete silence of the secular press on matters whose publication would be unfavorable to the

Roman Church is not hard to explain. That Church makes it hard for any paper which exposes the working of the Roman system in any way. In 1928 the Catholic weekly *America* published an article by a Jesuit priest under the heading, "Does It Pay Editors to Insult Catholics?" After describing the way the Washington Truth Society, composed of a priest and a number of laymen, succeeded in having a Washington newspaper so effectively boycotted as to serve as a warning to other Washington papers, the writer urged Catholics in other cities to follow this example. As quoted in the *Christian Advocate*, the priest thus explained and applied this Washington case:—

"The Washington Truth Society consisted of one active priest in charge, two zealous laymen, and a Catholic lawyer or two, ready to give legal advice free of charge. The letter-head was formidable with names of prominent men, but this heavy artillery was brought to bear only when urgently needed. In any city of the United States one zealous pastor with two or three active laymen, together with a legal adviser, could form a Truth Society that would batter to pieces bigotry when found in the pages of any local newspaper.

"The lessons learned in Washington, in 1913, may briefly be summed up as follows:—

"1. Do not attack a magazine or newspaper through its editorial departments, but act through its business office.

"2. When a magazine or newspaper is attacking your religion, write to the business manager and inform him that you will not buy the offending periodical again — and mean it.

"3. Call the attention of your friends to the insult and request them to call the attention of their friends. They,

too, should write and pledge themselves not to buy any offending paper —and mean it.

“4. Call the attention of the merchant with whom you deal to the insults and tell them that as long as they advertise in any offending paper, you will not buy their goods — and mean it.

“5. Call the attention of your pastor to the insults and suggest that he have his people pledge themselves never to buy any magazine or newspaper that insults the faith and never to deal with merchants who advertise in such periodicals — and mean it.

“6. Tell your news-dealer that as long as you see the magazine or newspaper on his stand, an open insult to you, you will not buy from him — and mean it.

“7. Call the attention of your local Catholic paper to the insult, but suggest to the editors not to give free publicity by naming the offender, rather to sound the slogan, ‘We will never buy a paper or magazine that insults our faith. — And mean it.’

“This plan is based on the simple fact that nobody, Catholic included, has to buy a magazine or newspaper if he does not want to.

“If Catholics follow the example of the Catholics in Washington, in 1913, we shall soon decisively answer the question which the editors of some secular periodicals are now asking themselves, ‘Does it pay to insult Catholics?’ ”

Nothing so illustrates the growing power exerted by the Roman priesthood upon the American press as the absence of all reference to Romanism by that most potent weapon, the cartoon. It was not always thus. Some of us remember the famous cartoon by Keppler entitled “The Shadow.” The cartoon, which was a double-spread in a popular magazine, showed a map of the United States

and across it from the East the shadow of the pope with his triple crown and staff. *Puck* brought a cartoon some thirty years ago, with the legend: "A kick that was a long time coming." The drawing showed a cow, marked "France," turning her gaze upon the milker, Pope Pius IX, who has just received a kick that sent him and his chair sprawling. A bucket has been upset, marked "Papal Revenues." Back and neck of the cow are covered with a swarm of flies, showing the figures of priests, monks, nuns, bishops and cardinals. The publication of such cartoons as just described is impossible to-day, not on account of any lack of material — the cartoonists of England, Germany, France and of the South American Republics do not seem to be hampered in that way — but because they dare not, and they dare not because the Roman boycott would descend upon the offending paper with crushing force.

The freedom of education, so intimately connected with the freedom of religion and freedom of speech, is under the ban of the *Syllabus* of Pius IX:

Proposition 47. *"The most perfect state of civil society requires that the common schools, which are open to the children of all classes of the people, and the public institutions in general, which are destined for teaching letters and the exact sciences, and educating the youth, should be exempted from the authority, direction, and interference of the Church, and be subjected to the absolute power of civil authority, at the discretion of the rulers of the state and according to the standard of prevailing public opinion."*

These propositions being condemned by the Church their contradictories must be true. In other words: There can be no legitimate plea for exempting the

schools from the authority of the Roman Church, whether they are mere elementary schools, or literary and scientific.

Accepting our school system as a fact that cannot be altered, the Roman priesthood is keeping a watchful eye on the texts that might give young America a "biased" conception of the papacy. It is generally admitted that no text book designed for use in the American public schools can be printed which reflects upon the Catholic church. The history texts particularly show the hand of the Roman censorship and here again it is the Middle Ages and the Reformation period that eliminate everything unfavorable to Catholicism. The papal claims are supported in the face of the clearest historical evidence. West's "Modern World" has this regarding the age about the year 700: "At the head of all this Church hierarchy stood the Pope, the spiritual monarch of Christendom. He was supreme lawgiver, supreme judge, supreme executive." Any tyro in history can recognize the falsehood of this as a description of the papal power at that time. Botsford's "History of the Ancient World," Morey's "Ancient History" and Harding's "Medieval and Modern History" similarly exalt the work of Roman ecclesiastics and cover up their ruthless misrule. Referring to these history texts *The Living Church* (Episcopal) said in 1922:

"We are facing a very serious, deadly, and determined attack upon our Church. The Church of Rome is extremely powerful, none the less so because she does not publish her power upon the first pages of the newspapers. The center of the attack is in the publishers. There is no use in objecting to the use of any particular book in the public schools if you cannot find any other book to put in its place. And there is none. No book can get published that does not pass the Roman censor. And the proof of this is that there is no book published that has not

passed the Romen censor. That is, there is not one single history that I know that is not full of Roman propaganda, and that does not very seriously slander and discredit the Anglican Church."

There was considerable agitation during 1916 in the church papers because of "A Bill to Amend the Postal Laws" which was presented in both houses of Congress for enactment. It had been urged by Roman Catholics in order to muzzle the Protestant press as much as possible and prevent it from uncovering some things in the past which are not altogether complimentary to the Romish Church. What led to this effort was primarily the anti-Roman Catholic propaganda conducted by the *Menace*, with whose methods we are by no means in sympathy. But it appeared that certain Lutheran papers which have exposed the errors and methods of Romanism were also included in the list of periodicals whose liberty was to be abridged. A Roman Catholic sheet named *Lutheraner* and *Lutheran Witness* of the Missouri Synod as being among them. The *Lutheran* (Philadelphia) said in comment: "As is well known, this body of Lutherans has taken the lead in exposing and counteracting very manifest and very pernicious attempts on the part of the Roman Catholic Church in this country to influence legislation in its behalf, and not a few protests have gone to Washington from this source. The latest one is the following, which is sent by the Pastoral Conference of Chicago:

"To the Honorable, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States:—

"We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States and official representatives of the Lutheran Pastoral Conference of Chicago, affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, a body of about two million Lutherans in the different States of the Union, vigorously protest against the passing and enactment of Bill H. R. 6468, entitled,

'A Bill to Amend the Postal Laws,' and also Bill 491, with the same title, or other bills of similar nature. We base our protest upon the following arguments, viz.:

"I. Since the Constitution of the United States in Article I of the Amendments guarantees freedom of speech and of the press to all its citizens, and explicitly prohibits and unreservedly condemns all abridging of said privilege, we consider the enactment of any law or legal measure curtailing the privilege of freedom of speech and of the press as unconstitutional in origin and undemocratic in practice, and we therefore vigorously protest against the forementioned bills and against all similar legislation.

"II. We, furthermore, consider the censorship of one man, *e. g.*, of the Postmaster-General, regarding the nature and character of literature that is to pass through the United States mails as un-American, contrary to the best interests of the Republic, and fraught with far-reaching evil consequences for the liberty and freedom of the individual citizen, which freedom has been guaranteed to each citizen, and is safeguarded by the Constitution of the United States. As loyal American citizens, prizing highly the institutions of our beloved country, above all the personal liberty which we enjoy, and which we look upon and regard as the bulwark and safeguard of our beloved free country, we, for conscience' sake, protest against said bills and against all legal measures abridging or in any way curtailing our precious personal liberty, especially freedom of speech and of the press, and we urge and beseech you to use your influence and best endeavors to prohibit the enactment of all legislation curtailing the freedom of speech and of the press, and thus to stand by, and support, the Constitution of the United States, to which we have all pledged allegiance and loyalty as citizens of the United States.

"III. We finally contend that if any individual or corporation believes to have been offended by public utterance in the press, and if they believe to have just cause for complaint, the civil courts of the country are there to look after, and to take care of, this matter, and that legal proceedings and suits for slander or libel can be begun and the offenders duly punished for all such offenses, but that there is no need of in any way jeopardizing the freedom of speech and of the press on this account by passing and enacting legal measures of the aforementioned nature.

"Hoping that we will not be deceived by the trust which we have placed in the honorable gentlemen of the Senate and the House of Representatives, we beg to remain, with due regard for your exalted position,

"P. Luecke, Chairman.

"L. Schmidtke, Secretary."

The *Lutheran* continued :

"The protest is so manifestly in accord with the Constitution of the United States and with the traditions and democratic spirit of the American people that it needs no defense; but it is well to call attention to this effort on the part of Roman Catholics to muzzle the Protestant press, at this particular time. The year 1917 is near at hand, and it is to be expected that the quadricentennial Reformation celebration will bring to light some facts of history not altogether pleasing to Roman Catholics. We should deplore any effort to exploit the errors and abuses of Rome in the manner in which the *Menace* has been doing. Nothing is to be gained by that method. There are Roman Catholics who are as sincerely devoted to their faith as we are to ours, and a campaign of abuse is beneath the dignity of any self-respecting Church. And yet honest and serious controversy has its place. Roman Catholics who have studiously and maliciously misrepresented history and have blackened the characters of the reformers far more viciously than even the *Menace* has attempted to darken things that are Roman, can have no just grievance if Protestants now paint history as they see it. This surely will be done, though we trust more in a positive and constructive manner than in the negative and critical spirit. When one takes up the books written on the Reformation by Roman Catholic authors, and become familiar with their animus and methods, it is not so easy to keep silence. These authors have thrown down the gauntlet, and Protestants can not be blamed for taking it up."

The American Battalions.

6. The American Battalions.

In 1910, Mr. Roosevelt, after his return from his African hunt had an unpleasantness with the Pope. When it was suggested to him that the Pope was willing to receive him if he promised not to visit the American Methodists in Rome, he refused to see the Pope, even as Vice-President Fairbanks in a similar situation had refused only a year or so previous. A former Spanish monk, now converted to Protestantism, Mr. Joan Ortez Gonzales, writing in the *Herald and Presbyter* of March, 1910, declared that Cardinal Merry del Val was earnestly hoping that Colonel Roosevelt would submit to the requirement, and that such submission would "be sure to promote the ascendancy of Catholic influence in American politics." Gonzales then points out a much more important fact than the Roosevelt incident. He lays emphasis on the fact that in May, 1909, the Roman Catholic Church here was changed from a missionary to a regular canonical basis. This he explains by saying that "while the Church is in the missionary stage, Catholics are forbidden to attempt to advance Church interests by political methods, must proclaim separation of Church and State and absolute religious freedom, and naturally so because they are then greatly in the minority. But on the contrary, when the Church becomes regular, Catholics, being subject to canonical requirements, must seek by political methods, if needs be, to secure State recognition and protection of all claims of the papacy, and every loyal Catholic is then bound by the very principles of his faith to obey the Church, even in political matters, and to sacrifice civil duty and even patriotism when these conflict with the

commands of his superiors; and, failing to do this, whether bishop or layman, he is guilty of mortal sin. In all truth, therefore, it may be said that the Catholic Church in America now stands openly committed, in theory, to a policy of political interference."

The *Christian Herald* said in 1913: "We are evidently destined to witness a struggle between an arrogant hierarchy, backed by the wealth, influence, and pomp of papal power revived in almost medieval magnificence, on the one hand, and the nation's love of civil and religious liberty and the enlightenment that comes from true education, on the other. The Christianity of Rome is not and never has been that of Christ. It seeks a "kingdom of this world."

The *Missionary* (Roman Catholic) published in Washington, D. C., in its issue for May, 1910, quoted with approval the following extract from a letter from one of its correspondents:

"It seems to me that the main support of Protestantism comes from the United States and England. * * * If we put an end to this effort in England and the United States by making these nations predominant Catholic, we will have removed the chief obstacle to the conversion of the whole world to the true faith. * * * A vigorous effort in the United States at this time will reduce the opposition to an insignificant condition. * * * In the course of another century, the (Protestant) sects will be a study for the historian and antiquarian, along with Arianism."

The article concludes by referring to the 13th and 17th chapter of Revelation as meaning that "the Papacy will be a dominating influence in the political affairs of the nations in the last days."

Highly significant, in this connection, is an editorial which was published in the *Western Watchman*, St. Louis, August 3, 1924, under the caption: "Shall We Have a Catholic Party?"

"The intense, almost insane opposition toward nominating a Catholic to the Presidency manifested at the recent Democratic convention has led to a discussion in the Catholic press as to the probability of the formation of a Catholic party.

"Irish Catholics, who have always been the 'backbone' of the Democratic party have seen their efforts for the party go unawarded, declares the New World of Chicago. Continuing, this paper points out:

"When victory crowned the party they were the leaders. When victory came, however,, they were expected to be content with the small crumbs that fell from the table of their masters. Just at present there is an undefined feeling that a Catholic who dares ambition the presidency under the aegis of the Democratic party is committing not only a blunder, but a fine piece of presumption. It is no politics to say that those who at the recent Democratic convention in New York have definitely forced into the open men who are willing to avail themselves of the prestige of Catholic workers, and who vetoed all Catholic ambition, ought to receive a full measure of praise, for their dauntless courage, and their downright fearlessness. Time has come when Catholics might just as well face an atmosphere that has long striven to keep them in tutelage, and is too complacent in regarding them as hewers of wood and drawers of water. If a Catholic cannot be elected President of the United States it is well to know it. If either party, Democratic or Republican, make such a statement, then it is time for Catholics to get into another party where such un-American tactics do not prevail.'

"The *Providence Visitor* calls upon Catholics to fight for their rights through the ballot, in the following editorial:

"Why should not Catholics have a proper share in political affairs? If Catholic deeds and works, which so visibly affect civil life, were taken into consideration and counted as ballots there would be no doubt as to our election. Shall we be forever content to remain as hewers of wood and carriers of water? That role should be ended now, and since the issue is not of our making, there is nothing left but to fearlessly fight those who would invade our rights and through the ballot, obtain what is our just due."

Instructions were issued to Catholic voters in the Philippines in 1907, that they must not vote for men to fill

responsible positions, except those who are true and loyal Catholics, quoting the decree of Pope Leo the Thirteenth to that effect. That Catholic voters must confer with their father confessors in order to learn for whom to vote, that they must never vote for any other than a true Catholic: must vote when they have a chance; must induce only Catholics to vote.

A conspicuous feature on the front page of the Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen* of November 9, 1912, was a double column article headed: "Many Catholics Elected. Five Governors and One U. S. Senator, etc." The introduction to that article congratulated the Roman church on the result of the election, which "brought into prominent public position a larger number of Catholics than heretofore in the history of the country." There followed a column list of congressmen, governors, and other state officers and prospective United States senators who are Catholics. On November 12 the Milwaukee *Free Press* discussed this article in an editorial so sane and moderate, yet so courageous and so genuinely American in its tone, that I feel constrained to place the greater portion of it before my readers. Here it is:

"The *Catholic Citizen* is unsparing in its denunciation of the efforts of certain organizations to inject 'religious issues' into our politics. Well enough; but is not this newspaper fostering just such activity by celebrating the election of Catholic officials simply because they are Catholics, in rejoicing that there are more Catholics in public office than 'heretofore in the history of the country,' by intimating, as it does in the present article, that there is a certain proportion of offices to which Catholics, as Catholics, are entitled? But we do not believe that any candidate should be elected because he is a Catholic, or a Methodist, or a Jew, or an adherent of any particular creed or faith. Nor do we believe that the election of any candidate should be celebrated for such a reason. To do that is not American. To do that is to invite the appearance of religion as a political issue, an event

which as a community or as a people Americans have much reason to fear and abhor.

"Just suppose the *Living Church* were to print a list of successful Protestant Episcopal candidates; or the *Examiner* a list of successful Baptist candidates; or the *Congregationalist* a list of successful Congregational candidates and so on, and each of these journals were to rejoice because of the ascendancy of its church in politics. How would the *Catholic Citizen* like that? For each one of the host of successful Catholic candidates, mentioned by the *Citizen*, who defeated an opponent less representative of the people and less able to serve the people, right-thinking American citizens will rejoice with our contemporary, just as they will rejoice over every adherent of any other faith who won out over a less desirable candidate. But it is furthest removed from their interest that these successful candidates are Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile, Calvinist or Unitarians, that this or that church has made a political showing. We trust that when our contemporary has thought the matter over not as a Catholic but as an American newspaper, it will come to the conclusion that the very surest way to raise the issue of religion in our elections is to advertise and celebrate the victory of Catholics merely because they are Catholics."

The growing influence of the Roman Church on the American public schools is a matter of common knowledge. We quote from a thoughtful article contributed by Rev. J. C. Mattes to the *Lutheran* in 1925:

"This aim is to be accomplished by introducing as many Roman teachers into the schools as possible and by controlling the course of instruction through the School Boards. This is perhaps a new policy and is just being appreciated by observers. Bitter political fights have brought it very much into evidence, for it has compelled the Roman bishops to reveal their intentions and to disclose the way in which they aim to carry out their obligations of assailing heretics and rebels. Under Protestant control the Roman element has had fair representation on the teaching force. Under Roman control the Protestants are denied a similar representation. Here are certain figures to prove it. They are the figures for three cities in two contiguous counties of Pennsylvania. The first we will call Berrytown. Here the population is approximately 52 per cent Protestant and 48 per cent

Roman. There is one Roman member on the School Board. There are 273 Protestant and 135 Roman public school teachers. In Collegetown the proportion of Roman and Protestant is probably about the same, there may even be a larger proportion of Protestant element. All the members of the School Board have been Protestants for a number of years. There are 443 Protestant and 394 Roman teachers. In both these cases, remembering the large number of Roman children attending parochial schools, the proportionate number of Roman teachers is probably greater than the attendance of Roman scholars would demand. Now we come to a smaller city which we will call Coalvale, which has about 17,000 inhabitants, about half Roman and half Protestant. Here the Roman element controls the School Board. At present there are six Romanists and one Protestant on the Board. Here there are 30 Protestant and 85 Roman Catholic teachers employed in the public schools. Draw your own conclusion and watch your own communities. Vigilance must protect liberty."

The papal flag, symbol of temporal power, has been raised in the United States. Cardinal Hayes subordinated the American Flag to this foreign ensign, in the Lexington Avenue Armory of New York, on May 8, 1924, at a review of the Sixty-ninth Regiment. The yellow and white papal flag was given the place of honor, above his head, and the American Stars and Stripes placed below, on an equal footing with the Irish flag. The New York *Herald-Tribune* for May 8, 1924, contained the following write-up:

"Last night, clad in his scarlet robes of a prince of the Roman Catholic church, Patrick Cardinal Hayes blessed the regiment, which he calls his very own. * * * Cardinal Hayes was seated on a raised dais. Above his head hung the papal flag, while the other four sides of the balcony were draped with Irish and American flags."

Query: Why should a church, if it is a church and not a political empire, have a flag at all?

The London *Times*, September 2, 1910, in reporting the preparations made for the Eucharistic Congress in

Montreal, said: "The vestments of cloth of gold to be worn by the Cardinals and other dignitaries are being specially made in Canada. A chasuble of cloth of gold decorated with maple leaves has a painting representing the union of Church and State, with these words: "*Quod Deus conjunxit, homo non separet.*"

There is the everlasting claim of Rome — "What God has joined together, man must not separate." No American prelate at that congress protested against such doctrine. He dare not.

The *Catholic Herald* of Sacramento, Cal., said in its issue of October 30, 1926:—

"Edward L. Hearn has been made a *Roman count* by Pope Pius XI, according to an official announcement from the Vatican. Mr. Hearn is European commissioner of the Knights of Columbus. His *title* is the first bestowed upon an American since the institution, three years ago, of the special commission of the Secretariat of State for granting titles of nobility."

An interesting bit of news hailed with obvious delight by Romanists. America's view of titles of nobility (in spite of the commission instituted at the Roman State Department) is sufficiently clear from her official documents. The founders of our republic knew from bitter experience of the injustice connected with a system that could create a "nobility" by granting such titles at will. They had seen a class of a privileged few spring up from it while favoritism was rampant. So they declared it incompatible with the ideals of the new republic. This they thought to be of sufficient importance to embed the prohibition of such titles in the very first article of our Constitution. Art. I, Sec. 9, reads:—

"No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States, and no person holding any office of profit and

trust under them shall without the consent of the Congress accept of any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever from any prince, king, or foreign state." The following section, Sec. 10, enjoins the same upon the several states: "No State shall * * * grant any title of nobility."

Romanists delight in titles of nobility. Their head in Rome freely bestows them. Catholics, even in a republic like America, herald the bestowing of titles with joy. All such proceedings are averse to the American mind. America was not to have any lords, earls, dukes, and counts. No less an American and clear-minded a genius than Alexander Hamilton declared: "Nothing need be said to illustrate the importance of prohibitions of titles of nobility. This prohibition may truly be called the cornerstone of republican government. For so long as titles are excluded, there can never be serious danger that the government will be other than that of the people." Lincoln cherished the same views. This American principle expresses itself in practise in this, that, if any foreigner with a title of this kind wishes to become a citizen of the United States, he must renounce his title and his order of nobility.

And here we have a citizen of the United States proclaimed a Roman count! He receives a title of nobility from the Pope. If Catholic Americans hail this with pride, it can only be at the cost of their American ideals.

**Some Forgotten Chapters
of Our History.**

7. Some Forgotten Chapters of Our History.

It is a fundamental doctrine among Roman Catholic writers upon the subject that although a distinction (not separation) is to be recognized between the Church and the State, there is yet the same intimate connection and relation between the two as between the soul and the body. History demonstrates that wherever it has been possible to do so, the Roman Catholic hierarchy has put this principle into practise, and has either, through the instrumentality of concordats, established the exact nature of this relationship or has assumed a sort of protectorate over the state by virtue of which the civil authority was made subject to ecclesiastical control. The experiences in France growing out of the annulment of the famous Concordat (Treaty) which had been in force for a century, illustrate the tenacity with which the Papacy clings to emoluments which it has secured from the state, and the turmoil which it is capable of creating when it is deprived of State aid.

In any country where Protestants are in the majority, the Roman Catholic Church never urges a concordat; but, adopting that principle of expediency which has characterized this organization from its beginning, it freely consents to the separation of the Church and the State. In such circumstances this policy results more favorably to the Roman Catholic interests and prevents Protestants from gaining those supposed advantages which arise from an alliance with the state. As the power and influence of the Roman Catholic Church increase in any country, their tendency to exert a controlling influence in the

affairs of State becomes more prominent, and their use of the solidarity of the Roman Catholic Church as a political power becomes more apparent. The members of all other Christian denominations unite with political parties as individuals, and they look for political rewards, not on account of church connection, but as citizens who have served well their party. In marked contrast with this is the Roman Catholic method. As indicating the difference and as an illustration of the present Roman Catholic aggressiveness in political matters, I submit a portion of an editorial in the *Western Watchman* (Roman Catholic) of December 16, 1908, in which the appointment of Mr. Richard Kerens as ambassador to Vienna is discussed. I invite attention to these utterances:

"At the close of the November election, when it became evident that Mr. Kerens was not to be senator from Missouri, we demanded for him, in the name of the hundreds of thousands of Catholics who had supported Mr. Taft, because of his honorable course on every question where the Church was concerned, that he should reward him with a first-class ambassadorship. We were bold in making this demand, first, because the Catholics of the country deserved recognition from the President; and, secondly, because we were sure that the new President was conscious of the obligation. We assured him that he could in no better way discharge that obligation than by honoring with a first-class foreign appointment a man whom every Catholic, lay and clerical, in the land loved and honored.

"There was not one bishop in the United States who did not desire Mr. Kerens' appointment, and some of them so assured the President.

"We rejoice at it (Mr. Kerens' appointment) for several reasons. We feel that Mr. Kerens has suffered very much politically for his pronounced and uncompromising Catholicity. He would be senator from Missouri to-day if he had been less of a Catholic. If there are any honors which a public man can receive because of his devotion to the Catholic Church, we feel it our duty to try to secure them for him. Then Mr. Kerens had

deserved very well of the whole Catholic Church. He had given largely of his ample means to promote her charities and activities in all parts of the country.

"He has many strong friends in and out of his party. But if his personal worth and the support of his friends proved inadequate to save him from neglect, the Catholics of the land came manfully to the front and saved the day."

The reasons given for demanding the appointment of Mr. Kerens and the frank avowal of the cause of the success of the effort in his behalf are worthy of note: 1) "The Catholics of the country deserved recognition from the President"; 2) "The new President was conscious of the obligation"; 3) All the bishops of the United States favored this appointment, "and some of them so assured the President"; 5) When considerations of personal worth and the support of his friends were not likely to prevail, "the Catholics of the land came manfully to the front and saved the day."

In view of these remarkable declarations we are led to inquire: 1) For what reason did President Taft feel conscious of any obligation to the Catholics of the country, unless he was conscious that the hierarchy had used their influence over their communicants to furnish a large block of votes for the Republican candidate for the presidency? 2) Why should the opinion of a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church be desired or sought concerning the appointment of an ambassador to a foreign court? 3) What bearing do the donations of Mr. Kerens to the Roman Catholic charities have upon the question of his fitness to represent the United States at the Austrian court? 4) How could Catholics save the day for Mr. Kerens unless they appealed to the power of the church as a voting factor in political contests? 5) Has it already come to this that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States can openly demand political favors and

118 SOME FORGOTTEN CHAPTERS OF OUR HISTORY.

insist upon their being granted in return for the influence of the church in a presidential election?

Commenting on the incident, Mr. W. W. Prescott said in *Liberty*:

"Those optimistic writers and speakers who have no forebodings of evil because of the rapid growth of the Roman Catholic Church in America may find food for profitable reflection in this self-confessed mixing of the Roman Catholic Church with politics. It forcibly suggests what we may expect in the future."

If ever the Roman Catholic hierarchy succeeded in "putting one over" on the American people, it was by the establishment in 1910 of October 12 as Columbus Day. Wherever the day was celebrated, the priesthood stepped boldly into the lime-light and received the honors of the occasion. In Chicago, representatives were on hand from Canada to the Argentine Republic and every nation of importance between them. Vice-President James S. Sherman, Charles Murphy, Secretary of State of Canada, and Judge Grosscup, were gathered with Jesuit fathers, Knights of Columbus officials, and church dignitaries about the festal board, kow-towing to the power of Romanism, and giving vent to much rhetoric in praise of the Catholic Church as a "pathfinder of civilization."

When Archbishop Ireland consecrated six new bishops at St. Paul in 1910, Governor Eberhart and his staff headed the procession of six hundred priests and stood guard of honor at the entrance of St. Mary's chapel while the procession filed in. "Considered merely as a citizen and as a private individual," was the comment of *Folkebladet*, —

"it is the governor's civil, religious, and social privilege, as it is the privilege of any other citizen, to kiss the pope's slipper, if he wants to, or lick the dust under the archbishop's feet, if he so desires and sees any material gain from his action, and

stand guard of honor for 600 or 1,000 Catholic priests and seminarists, if that is to his liking. But when he, and his staff, in their official garb come forward and give an affair of the church an official character, he is no longer Mr. Eberhart, but Governor and representative, not of the Catholics, but of the entire population of the state and as such has no authority to give one denomination the appearance and prestige of being the real religion of the state. From an ecclesiastical as well as from a civil standpoint we feel constrained to utter a protest against such tactless — not to use a stronger term — misuse of a high office, dangerous and reprehensible even aside from any consideration of the constant menace to which the other denominations, and even the American principle of liberty, are exposed through the ambitions of priest-ruled Catholicism."

In 1916 the conflict between Mayor Mitchel of the City of New York and Roman Catholic ecclesiastics was a country-wide sensation. The Mayor had found conditions prevailing in the public and private child-caring institutions within the jurisdiction of New York City so bad that he determined to do all he could to improve them. In some of these institutions children were found with their hair knotted with lice, their scalps covered with itching sores, their bodies covered with filthy clothes that had not been changed in three weeks, their bodies underfed and undernourished, deprived of any reasonable opportunity for recreation, compelled to sit on backless wooden benches, some of them compelled to bathe, ten, fifteen, or twenty-five standing on a trough of six inches of water, many of them compelled to use the same towel after bathing, and other kindred conditions.

In the private institutions conducted by the Catholic Church and receiving money from the city for the care of children committed to their charge, Mr. Mitchel met with the opposition of the Church — at first insidious, and then open. The Mayor was a Roman Catholic, but this did not deter him from speaking plainly to the Cath-

olic ecclesiastics who were interfering with the reform. He said: "For the last two years and a half there has been a well-organized and purposeful conspiracy conducted by a certain number of co-religionists of my own, acting with other persons to interfere with the proper and orderly conduct or control of the private charitable institutions in the city." Speaking before the Thompson Legislative Committee he further stated that the police had obtained evidence substantiating the charges of conspiracy by the "supervision" of certain telephones, called "wire-tapping," among them that of Father Farrell, and he went on to say: "Now, gentlemen of the committee, I stated that there was a conspiracy, in my opinion, on the part of certain clergymen and laymen to obstruct the due administration of the laws to interfere with Government — in short, religious interference with the government of this city, which is a thing, I think, contrary to the genius of American institutions, because if there is one thing that is fundamental of ours in American life, it is that, just as we declare that Government shall not lay its hand upon the altar of the Church, so the Church shall not lay its hand upon the altar of the Government. And let me say that while I am Mayor, it will not."

The Churchman (Episcopalian) said editorially:

"The necessity for measures of protection against Vatican interference has been learned by most of the Roman Catholic countries in Europe and in South America. It is time for the people of the United States to recognize this fact and to realize that their own liberties and traditions must be safe-guarded from the operations of Vatican politicians in their minor as well as their major manifestations. If the Roman Catholic Church in the United States is now unfortunately becoming embroiled in political controversies, the fault lies with its leaders who are trying here to apply the sinister mandates of autocratic government manufactured on the right bank of the Tiber. There is no prejudice in the United States against the religious practices of

Roman Catholics, but if Roman Catholics continue to conduct a propaganda based upon a system of intrigue and wire-pulling such as that revealed by Mayor Mitchel before the investigating committee it becomes clearly the duty of Americans to frustrate the machinations of Vatican clerical policy. The situation is serious enough when a newspaper of the standing of the New York *Evening Post* declares in its comments on Mayor Mitchel's testimony that every influence, open or secret, fair or foul, has been brought to bear in the way of intimidating those who are conducting the investigation. 'Commissioner Strong, it is known, also Governor Whitman, have been plied with appeals and menaces from Catholic sources. Newspapers have received letters from Catholics warning them to keep off this matter.'"

The following was quoted by the *Oriental Consistory Magazine* of September, 1920, from the *National Catholic Register*:

"It is God's plan that the Holy Father of Rome should be the temporal and spiritual head of his Kingdom on Earth. It is the same to-day as in the time of the first pope. The best way to accomplish this is through political power, through religious education and service.

"God has doubly blessed the Catholic Church of America by placing one of its most faithful sons at the right hand of President Wilson. Next to the President, Joseph Tumulty, Knight of Columbus, fourth degree, wields the greatest political power of any man in America, and as a true Catholic he is exercising the great trust that God has given unto his hands for the glory of the holy church. Through his tact and holy zeal he has created a warm friendship between the Catholic Church and President Wilson, together with the Democratic party. Other presidents have feared the power of the holy church and have courted its support, politically, by granting it childish favors, which deceived no one. But this is the first time in the history of the country when the President and a great political party have sought an equal and honest alliance with the Catholic Church. And before seeking this alliance, the President and his party have shown their good faith by works.

122 SOME FORGOTTEN CHAPTERS OF OUR HISTORY.

"Through the efforts of the Hon. Joseph Tumulty, President Wilson has practically granted that education in the Philippines shall be under the control of the Catholic Church and that religious activity in the great American Army shall be under the direction of the Knights of Columbus. This means an addition to the church of one million young men, or at least their strong preference and sympathy for the Catholic Church. We must make the most of this opportunity. President Wilson has also shown every encouragement and sympathy with the program of the Church in bringing the war-orphaned children of France to this country. These children are solidly Catholic and will be reared and educated in the faith. All these things, and more, show that President Wilson and the Democratic party is the one in which is found almost ninety percent of the Catholics. By an alliance between the Catholic Church and the Democratic party the ideals of both will be made secure by creating a dominant political organization. This may be proved by actual figures. This country is normally Republican by about three million votes. There is not much doubt that the Catholic Church can give to the Democratic party two million more votes, especially with women suffrage, because of their noble devotion to the cause; in their noble devotion to the Church the women of the Catholic Church will vote first for its interests.

"The Catholics will soon have the opportunity to prove their appreciation of President Wilson's friendship, and at the same time increase their political prestige and strength. The Republicans are making desperate efforts to wrest control of congress from the Democratic party, and in this way discredit the President. Their party machinery is quiet but deadly. In elections that have already been held, they have made decided gains, partly through the indifference of the Democratic voters. Every Catholic must awake to his duty and stand by his Church and President Wilson. Your duty is plain. The Republican party is the recognized and open enemy of the Catholic Church. Every recognized leader in its organization from the lowest to the highest is a member of the secret and pagan order of Masonry, the ancient and most dangerous enemy of the Holy Catholic Church and the true faith."

In confirmation of United Press dispatches that the Pope was seeking to establish diplomatic relations between

the vatican and the United States government, the London *Globe's* correspondent said in the same year :

"I am able to state that the pope is exerting himself personally with a view to the institution of diplomatic relations between the United States and the vatican. He recently took this step, addressing an autograph letter, very courteous in its nature, to President Taft on the subject. The dispatches referred to stated the pope had, besides other steps, commissioned Cardinal Vannutelli to ask United States Ambassador Leishmann to inform the United States government that the pope was anxious for the establishment of a United States legation at the vatican. The pope also requested Falconio, the apostolic delegate to the United States, to lay the matter before Cardinal Gibbons, with the request that he interest Archbishops Farley of New York, O'Connell of Boston, Glennon of St. Louis, and Ireland of St. Paul on the subject. The intimation was that if the movement succeeded, the chances of the archbishop to be raised to the cardinalate would be enhanced."

Cardinal O'Connell in an interview given to the press in 1924 served notice that hereafter, when he was present at any function as an apostolic legate, he wanted to be received with all the honors due a representative of a reigning sovereign. But let the eminent prelate tell the story himself. He was speaking of his visit to Washington, attending the Holy Name Convention, at which time President Coolidge spoke, and the cardinal was present as an "apostolic legate," which means that he was the personal representative of the Pope. *The Boston Herald*, reporting an official interview submitted by the cardinal himself, says the cardinal was asked :

"What is an apostolic legate, and are any of these legates, when they are sent to different parts of Europe, received with all the royal honors as the personal representatives of a sovereignty?"

"Oh, yes," he replied, "an apostolic legate, as a personal representative of the sovereign pontiff, is received, certainly in Italy, with the honors that would be given to visiting sovereigns."

124 SOME FORGOTTEN CHAPTERS OF OUR HISTORY.

"Were you pleased with the reception offered you by the authorities in Washington?" asked the reporter.

"Why, yes; the President was extremely considerate and courteous, and the commissioners of the District of Columbia were equally so. Of course, as this was the first time in the history of America that there was a papal legate named, there was no precedent."

Thus with delicate diplomacy the officials of all American governmental units, from the Chief Executive in the White House to the mayor of the pueblos, are notified that when a cardinal bears the dignity of "apostolic legate" he is to be received with "royal honors."

It is not enough to render him the usual courtesies offered to distinguished visitors and government officials; he must be received with the same pomp and circumstance that would be accorded the representative of the King of England.

We have heard of Roman Catholic "Field Masses." The latest repetition of this disgusting event was reported May 31, 1926, from Fort Sill, Oklahoma. It would not be unusual in a country where there is Union of Church and State, but in the United States it appears incongruous. No objection is raised to a Roman Catholic chaplain conducting his services and inviting the public to such services. These are rights which should readily be admitted. But when the Commandant and Officers of a Field Artillery School issue, presumably at the expense of public funds, an engraved official invitation to a Field Mass, it is a violation of the American principle of separation of Church and State.

Assistant Secretary of War MacNider, in his reply to a letter from Gen. W. McDavid, objecting to what was done, states: "A mass such as was celebrated at Fort Sill on Memorial Day is observed quite frequently on

special occasions in the Army." All the worse! That is no justification but a confession. The secretary adds: "The effect has been to stimulate interest in the entire program of religious instruction for the military service, Protestant, Jewish, and Roman Catholic." That is his deduction, and it is an erroneous one. He ignores those who are not Protestant, Jewish or Roman Catholic. He assumed that it is a function of the government to give "religious instruction." He concludes that the official "support" of a sectarian rite stimulates religious interest in thoughtful people who have an aversion to it.

Is our War Department committed to this position?

There is food for thought in a book by a French professor of history, Charles Guignebert, which bears the simple title "Christianity." Speaking of the Roman Church in a chapter, "The Triumph of Romanism" the author says:—

"She [the Roman Church] has modernized her ways and methods of action, taking as her pattern the measures usually adopted in political struggles. She makes use of aggressive newspapers, which feel no scruples concerning Christian charity and delicacy. * * * In addition to her own journals she directs or inspires numerous publications of all kinds, carefully edited to suit all stages of development and culture. She has formed, or else favors, varied associations, leagues, and federations which concentrate her strength by bringing together and disciplining her partisans. * * * She attempts to realize her ideals by such methods as press propaganda, meetings multiplied, and ever more huge congresses, especially Eucharistic Congresses, in which she develops the seductions of her liturgical pomp on the biggest scale and puts forth the greatest appeals to collective emotion, and by 'weekly

126 SOME FORGOTTEN CHAPTERS OF OUR HISTORY.

study courses.' * * * Finally she has her own electoral policy and her political directives. She takes her hand in the great game played by the various parties centered around every government. In particular she tries to retain her influence in the education of the young or to recover it where she has lost it. This is the reason she has embarked upon an offensive, more or less successful, in Germany, France, and Italy for the support of sectarian schools. The hour is approaching when the battle will be waged as eagerly in England, *the United States*, and all the countries in which the Church feels herself menaced by state schools, which are laic and unsectarian."

The Pope and the Presidency.

8. The Pope and the Presidency.

Why do many American citizens view with alarm the candidacy of Roman Catholics for high political office? Unquestionably, Roman Catholics have bled and died for this country as freely and as nobly as Protestants. They have left their mark in the social development of our country and have rendered their share of public service. Is therefore, the widespread Protestant opposition to the nomination of a Roman Catholic for President nothing but a relic of times of strife that should be forgotten, the mark of an illiberal, un-American mentality? I am inclined to doubt it. The attitude of many of our citizens toward this issue is the product of certain convictions and feelings which are worthy of serious consideration. They may be right or wrong in this attitude; but the only way to reform them, if they are in error, is to convince them by facts and logic. They are neither bigots nor fanatics. No right-minded Protestant would deny the utmost freedom of religion to all citizens. Yet he has certain deep convictions about the relation of religion and churches to American institutions, American principles and their future. He feels, rightly or wrongly, that the Protestant movement in history, is the mother, not only of European civilization but of American institutions.

The class of Protestants I have in mind, and they are many, who cherish these convictions desire to be fair and just to Roman Catholic citizens. They do not question the patriotism of Catholic candidates for office. But they have certain convictions about the Roman hierarchy and they are puzzled to know how one can be a good Roman Catholic without endorsing un-American ideals and principles.

The question has been raised why there was no protest against Mr. Taft on account of his Unitarianism. That question is suggestive. The answer to it reveals the fact that the theological beliefs of a President do not alarm most Protestants who may differ from him. In the case of Roman Catholics, however, personal religion is bound up with the acceptance of the Pope's infallibility. The Pope, speaking as spiritual overlord, claims temporal allegiance from every Christian and condemns the principle of religious freedom. And in the sphere of practical politics, the Protestants I am attempting to describe fear that this foreign hierarchy and its native official representatives would capitalize the influence, in the way of conferring patronage and the disbursement of funds, as also in international relations, of American Catholics elected or appointed to high office. Chiefly the fact that the highest positions of power and influence in the Catholic Church are filled by direct appointment of the Pope, whom all bishops and cardinals are bound to obey, is causing apprehension in many circles.

The kissing of a Cardinal's ring by the Governor of a State may be a trivial event. It can be and has been defended as a mark of respect by a gentleman of religion to the Church of which he is a member. But it is believed that a Cardinal's ring is a symbol and its kissing is a recognition of ecclesiastical claims inconsistent with American principles. How do ecclesiastics construe such acts? What are their historic claims for the Church and for themselves in relation to personal freedom, political self-government and the nature and authority of the State? If we are honest with facts, can we deny that this trivial act justifies such considerations?

Naturally, if such a controversy is made a part of a Presidential campaign, it is difficult to see how it could

be carried on in an atmosphere of goodwill and tolerance. Be that as it may, they misread the convictions and feelings of multitudes of Americans who think it is possible to confine such a Presidential campaign to the discussion of economic and political issues. It simply could not be done, however deplorable or disastrous such a conflict might be.

Addressing the *New York Times* of December 26, 1926, Rev. Alfred W. Wishart said:

"We may as well face the issue, before the class of intelligent and fair-minded Protestants I have in mind can be mentally at peace, they will want to know whether an American Catholic Presidential candidate endorses the claim of the Papacy to temporal power, its toleration, not its acceptance of American principles, its attitude toward American public schools and its rejection of the claims of millions of American Christians to the right of self-government in religion, as well as in politics. They believe, once more rightly or wrongly, that if one does not endorse Rome in such matters, he may be a real American according to their standard, no matter what his personal religion may be. They respect the character and applaud the patriotism of the Roman Catholics; but when it comes to the Presidency of the United States, then convictions about the Papacy as an institution compel them to pause and reflect.

"I believe this to be a fairly accurate description of a state of mind that must be reckoned with in this country, I do not defend or attack it. It is a factor in American life which merits serious consideration, because it is the mental attitude of men and women who are no more intolerant bigots than are those who denounce them in the name of patriotism and religious liberty.

"So, if the American people must face this issue, let us discuss it on its merits. Vituperation on either side neither makes converts nor deters the brave and honest from the path of duty as they see it."

At a union Protestant meeting in the New National Theater of Washington, D. C., Rev. Randolph McKim (Episcopalian) in 1913 said in part:

"I ask you, then, my fellow-citizens, is it not time for all Protestants to take counsel together for the security of our liberties, for the preservation of the heritage of personal liberty — liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, liberty of action which we received from our forefathers? Colonial America was Protestant, overwhelmingly so, and the statesmen and patriots of the Revolution were also overwhelmingly Protestant, though there were many Roman Catholics who nobly and bravely labored and fought and suffered with them. But the idea which gave birth to the Revolution were the offsprings of the Protestant Reformation. The principles which lay at the root of the American Constitution were born of the Reformation; and it behooves us, whose ancestors pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for American independence, to guard those principles of liberty from every open or secret assault.

"Will any man say that I exaggerate the situation?

"What then? Why this? Our great American votership must realize the seriousness of the crisis and make common cause against this insidious menace to our liberties. They must come out into the open and stand together in solid phalanx against all these invasions of personal liberty. Not in anger; not in bitterness; not with violence of speech or of action, but calmly, resolutely, with invincible determination that the principles of our Constitution shall be preserved inviolate, and that our citizens shall enjoy absolute freedom of speech and action, without any constraint or intimidation of any kind whatsoever."

In conclusion he addressed himself to the Roman Catholic citizens as follows:

"In the name of the great republic, we bid you remember that you, as well as we, owe obedience to our Constitution and laws, not in the letter only, but in spirit. Be content with the liberty you enjoy to profess and practise and propagate your religion, without meddling in politics; without attempting to coerce or intimidate free American citizens; without using the boycott or the bludgeon to accomplish your ends. In short, to propagate your religion wholly by rational and spiritual means. In other words, be content to be a spiritual, not a political, religious organization; and beware that you make no attempt, direct or indirect, to tamper with the sacred principles of our

Constitution. Then there will be peace between us, and we can live and labor together for the honor and glory of our common country."

The Roman Catholic parishioner, whether oiler on a freight steamer or President of the United States, must acknowledge an authority higher than the federal constitution, higher than any law, the authority of the Pope at Rome. Whether digging a canal in Illinois or writing opinions as Chief-Justice of the United States, he has an Italian boss.

How can a Roman Catholic soldier, judge, governor, or president swear to uphold the government of the United States against any hostile power without making a mental reservation in favor of the Pope, who, let it not be forgotten, speaks to him as Christ's vicar on earth through his representative, the parish priest? The word of his father-confessor is law to the Catholic. A Catholic office-holder is bound not by the constitution, nor by any civil or moral law, nor any obligation whatever, but by the will of Pope Pius XI announced to him through the priest from whom he receives his Easter communion. And he has been taught to believe that unless he acknowledges the authority of the Pope in all things, spiritual or temporal, he must be eternally damned.

In commenting on this *The Christian Statesman* says:

"Doubtless the membership of the Roman Catholic Church would, in the course of time, outgrow these notions were it not for the actual exercise of all the authority here claimed by the papal hierarchy. Like the members of all Protestant sects they would conform to the principles of liberty which prevail in this land. But unhappily the members of the Catholic communion are not free to make any such changes or to yield to any such influence. They are bound on pain of eternal condemnation to yield an unquestioning and primary obedience to the hierarchy which has its seat in the Vatican. Roman Catholics cannot be

trusted therefore to take positions of responsibility in this government until one of two things occurs: either the papal hierarchy itself must change so as to conform to more reasonable ideas of liberty, or the Catholic Church in this country must declare its independence of the hierarchy. There are no visible signs yet of either of these events occurring."

Every loyal Roman Catholic owes allegiance to the Pope at Rome, a foreign ecclesiastical power, above the Constitution of the United States. *The Christian Advocate* (Methodist), of New York, well said in 1924:

"The objection to a Roman Catholic president goes deeper than creed — or rather it goes to that fundamental tenet of the Roman creed which sets the hierarchy above the law of the land and compels its adherents to surrender the keeping of their consciences to the church, a church whose supreme pontiff has been and still remains to be a temporal sovereign, and whose autocratic arm stretches out from the Tiber across oceans and national boundaries."

Then the *Advocate* calls attention to a recent article in the *Century Magazine* by Mr. Belloc, an eminent Roman Catholic writer, who frankly says:

"The Catholic church is in its root principle at issue with the civic definition of freedom and authority. Religion must be for the Catholic first a supreme authority, superior to any claims of the state . . . that conflict with which Europe is acquainted to the full and which has filled the history of two thousand years, from the time of Nero to our own, is inevitable."

The Roman Catholic system is to be judged by what it has done through the centuries, when it had the power, and what it is doing in every land where its authority is supreme. The pages of history are dyed with the blood of martyrs who were put to death because they would not surrender their consciences to the Pope. The *Word and Way* (Baptist) correctly expressed the sentiment of a multitude when it said in 1924:

"It is the interference in matters of our government, inspired by, and dictated from, the Vatican, that stirs the resentment and

patriotism of non-Catholics. The Roman Catholic hierarchy is not, in fact, a religious, but a political system; it is not a church, but an empire. The pope claims, and his adherents claim for him infallibility. According to this claim, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, his voice is the voice of God. From his official deliverances there is no appeal. His voice and his power claim supremacy over the whole world. In addition to the claim of infallibility is the claim of temporal power. He is not only considered supreme in the matter of religion, but in the matter of civil government. According to its claim, the Vatican is, by divine right, the world's throne room, and all the governments of the earth are by divine intention subjects of Vatican power. According to the system, the pope is lord over the governments of the earth, the supreme ruler and dictator in religion, and the lord of every man's conscience.

"The freedom about which the advocates of the papal system are howling is the freedom of that system to function without any limitations — the freedom to bring every government, every man, his religion and conscience under its control."

People of America need to be on their guard against the encroachment of Roman Catholicism. We draw our conclusions from history and from certain facts and tendencies which must be apparent to every thoughtful citizen of this nation.

Discussion of a Roman Catholic candidate's availability for the Presidency became widespread some six years ago when Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York was first prominently mentioned as a Democratic candidate for this office. It is a mistake, however, to think that Protestant "bigotry" was to blame for the raising of this issue. On the contrary, this was largely due to the Roman Catholic press itself. *The Lutheran* (Philadelphia) has recently reminded us that the editors of current periodicals of the Roman communion began six years ago to challenge the nation to reject Mr. Smith as an aspirant for the presidency because of his church connection.

"Their frequent references to the first amendment to the constitution of the United States (which is applied to mean that no candidate for a public office shall be required to pass a religious test) have appeared with increased frequency in *America*, *The Commonwealth*, and the diocesan weekly we see, until now it is a rare issue that does not take a slap at bigotry (Protestant of course) and assert that a man's religion is no disqualification for the presidency. If Mr. Smith's church relations cut no figure, of what particular interest is his nomination to the Roman Catholic leaders and editors? Why do they continually cram it down the throats of all and sundry that it is un-American to oppose a candidate because he is a Catholic?"

The Atlantic Monthly articles on this topic during 1927 were the literary sensation of the year. Mr. Ch. C. Marshall, a Boston lawyer, directed a public letter to Governor Smith setting forth the reason why many American citizens hesitate to consider a Roman Catholic for the highest office in the land. Governor Smith replied through the pages of the same magazine. He closed his article with the stirring pronouncement:

"In this spirit I join with fellow-Americans of all creeds in a fervent prayer that never again in this land will any public servant be challenged because of the faith in which he has tried to walk humbly with his God."

What American would disagree with this position? — unless there be something in the creed of any faith that holds within it the possibilities of political interference, claims to temporal powers and a demand of unlimited obedience in certain matters from all of its followers. Then the question must be raised. Has it been fair to raise the question in connection with Mr. Smith's membership in the Roman Church? We suggest an answer by comparing Mr. Smith's creed with the Pope's creed.

The introduction to Mr. Smith's creed: "I believe in the worship of God according to the faith and practice of

the Roman Catholic Church," the implications of this statement we will consider later. We will first consider in order the following statements*:

I. "I recognize no power in the institutions of my Church to interfere with the operations of the constitution of the United States or the enforcement of the law of the land."

Pius IX in the famous *Syllabus* of 1864 condemned the proposition that "The Church does not have the power of using force nor any other direct or indirect temporal power." Error 24. He likewise in the same document condemns the proposition that "In a conflict of the laws of either power (Church or State) the civil law should prevail." Error 42.

The same pope in a promulgation of December 21, 1867, attacking certain Austrian laws as they related to the Church said, "By our apostolic authority we reject and condemn, and the law itself with all its consequences we declare, by virtue of the same authority, to have been and to be wholly null and void."

II. "I believe in absolute freedom of conscience for all men and in equality of all churches, all sects, and all beliefs before the law as a matter of right and not as a matter of favor."

In the *Syllabus* of 1864 Pius IX condemns the teaching "That in our times it is no longer proper that the Catholic religion be held as the only established religion, all other sects whatsoever being excluded." Error 77. Likewise he condemns the idea "That every man is free to embrace and confess any religion which, led by the light of reason, he regards as true." Error 15. The Encyclical of Gregory XVI, dated August 15, 1832, has been quoted in our first chapter.

* In the following I am making use of the lucid comment on Mr. Smith's reply by Rev. J. C. Mattes in *The Lutheran* of May 26, 1927.

III. "I believe in the absolute separation of Church and State and in the strict enforcement of the provisions of the constitution that congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

We have supplied sufficient authentic papal comment on this position in earlier chapters of this book. The Popes have condemned this opinion of Mr. Smith's as heretical.

IV. "I believe that no tribunal, of any church, has any power to make any decree of any force in the law of the land, other than to establish the status of its own communicants within its own church."

We have seen that Pius IX in the *Syllabus* denies that the Church must always obey the laws of the land in secular relations. He condemns the proposition that "the immunities of the Church and ecclesiastical persons have their origin out of civil law." Error 30.

V. "I believe in the support of the public school as one of the cornerstones of American liberty. I believe in the right of every parent to choose whether his child shall be educated in the public school or in a religious school supported by those of his own faith."

Plainly heretical. Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Tametsi Future*, claims that all education must be governed by "Christ the Lord" — by which he means Catholicism (ed. Herder, p. 28 f).

Mr. Smith insists that he is not responsible for the utterances of the popes. "You have no more right to ask me to defend every statement coming from a prelate than I should have to ask you to accept as an article of your religious faith every statement of an Episcopal bishop." That is a beautiful half truth. The Episcopalians make no such demands from their communicants, but it is a fundamental teaching of the Roman communion that the laity must give unquestioning assent to all that the Church teaches directly or indirectly concerning faith

and morals, that they must obey the hierarchy in all such matters, that their consciences must be instructed by their father confessors and that, above all, the whole church is to be instructed by the pope in his official declarations. Our earlier chapters have quoted the relevant passages from recent Encyclicals. The official creed of Catholicism is very clear on this point:

"If anyone should say that the Roman pontiff merely has the official duty of supervision or direction, not however the full and supreme power of jurisdiction in the universal Church, not only in those matters which pertain to faith and morals, but even in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church spread abroad through the whole earth; or that he has only the pre-eminent part and not the entire fullness of this supreme power, or that this power of his is not regular and immediate either in relation to each and every church or in relation to each and every believer, let him be anathema." Vatican Council, Second Session, July 18, 1870.

"The Roman pontiff, the successor of the blessed Peter in the primacy, has not only the primacy of honor, but also the supreme and full power of jurisdiction in the universal Church, both in the matters which pertain to faith and morals and in those which pertain to the discipline abroad in the whole earth." Canon Law, Canon 218.

Mr. Smith's position has been condemned in more than one Catholic paper. The *Fortnightly Review*, St. Louis, 1927, p. 276, contained the following under the caption:

"The Liberalism of Governor Smith":

"Writing editorially in the *Catholic World* (June) Father Gillis expresses the hope that Governor Smith of New York will be nominated for the presidency, for the curious reason that 'he will then be defeated and his defeat will show that anti-Catholic bigotry is rampant and triumphant.'

"In our opinion the defeat of Governor Smith would show nothing of the kind, for the simple reason that, because of his stand on prohibition, on account of his Tammany affiliation, and for a variety of other reasons, a large number of Catholics who ordinarily vote the Democratic ticket would vote against him.

"It is not possible to gather the Catholics of the United States solidly behind any candidate, simply because he professes the Catholic faith. There are reasons why staunch and loyal Catholics should and will oppose Governor Smith on other grounds than his 'wet' attitude and his Tammany connections. One of them is that his reply to Charles C. Marshall has shown Smith to be a dangerous Liberal in religion. Italian Catholic papers (e. g. 'Fede e Ragione' of Fiesole, No. 19 sqq.) stigmatize his letter as 'heretical' and call him a dangerous man from the Catholic point of view. No wonder the Papal Secretary of State declared through the Apostolic Delegate in Washington that the Vatican is not interested in his candidacy. A fair minded Protestant as president would be infinitely preferable to a Catholic politician saturated with the liberalism so strongly condemned by Pius IX and Leo XIII."

As we have already noted, the first shots of the religious campaign which made the election of 1928 so memorable in American history, were exchanged through the pages of the *Atlantic Monthly* in April, 1927. Governor Smith gave assurance that the apostolic letters of the Popes did not affect an American Catholic's relation to his government, — a statement for which he was called a heretic, as we have seen, in several Roman Catholic journals. It was brought out in June, 1927, that Governor Smith, as a delegate to the 1915 constitutional convention, sponsored a proposal which, if adopted and ratified, would have made it possible for the Legislature to vote state support for the Catholic schools. Even at that time Protestants in States south of Mason and Dixon's line were being bombarded with antiCatholic literature. But it was the Democratic convention itself that injected the Catholic issue. In his address as permanent chairman Senator Robinson hurled defiance at an "intolerance" that no convention of politicians, no gathering of churchmen, and no organization of ministers had espoused or expressed. Later in the campaign, Governor Smith's Oklahoma City speech was virtually a dare to

liberal-minded Protestants to vote against him, under penalty of showing themselves bigots if they do. The Lutheran Editors' Association, about this time, issued a statement regarding dangers which threatened our country from Roman aggression (in spite of its disclaimer of any intention to tell Lutherans how to vote, a partisan document, such as every statement of the kind had to be during this campaign). Bishop Noll, of Fort Wayne, replied to this statement in one of the weakest rejoinders we have ever seen, since it did not deny the cardinal Lutheran objection that the Pope by divine right claims the privilege of issuing orders to human governments. At no time during the campaign did any Catholic churchman deny the correctness of this fundamental allegation.

The Catholic weeklies bristled with articles complaining of the "intolerance" and "bigotry" of those citizens who had certain misgivings concerning the election of a Roman Catholic candidate. Aside from the fact that the religious issue was injected into the campaign by Mr. Smith himself, it is a wrong use of the word bigotry or intolerance when applied to those who, recognizing the political aims of Romanism, gave utterance to such misgivings. A point which has not been sufficiently stressed is that set forth in the *Christian Century*. Under the heading, "Browbeating the Protestants" that paper said:—

"Under the Constitution of the United States it is provided that no religious test shall ever be applied as a qualification for holding public office. This provision was put into the Constitution by a preponderantly Protestant public opinion. No Protestant citizen of the United States would modify a single syllable of this provision or would tolerate its violation. If Governor Smith is duly elected to the Presidency by securing a majority

of the electoral vote on November 6, no Protestant would raise a finger in opposition to his taking office.

"What, then, is all the excitement about? What is the so-called 'religious' issue?

"The so-called religious issue has to do with the 'if'—*if* he is duly elected. The Constitution guarantees that any man *who is elected* to civil office shall not be disqualified because of his religion or his lack of religion. It does not forbid the voter to take a candidate's religion into account in deciding whether to vote for or against him. Citizens have some rights, as well as candidates, and one of those rights is to exercise choice on any grounds they please in casting their ballots. One may vote for or against a candidate for any one of a thousand reasons, wise or foolish — because he is of German ancestry, or speaks French, or has red hair, or is a member of the G. A. R., the Y. M. C. A., the Knights of Columbus, or the Methodist Church. The voter may choose foolishly, but he is not nullifying the Constitution if he decides that a candidate's religious affiliations indicate attitudes of which he does not approve or subject him to influence in the direction of policies of which he does not approve.

"What the Constitution guarantees is that, *if a candidate is elected*, either because of or in spite of all the whims or convictions that determine the casting of votes, whims and convictions about religion included, he shall not be disqualified because of his religion. If he gets the electoral vote, he gets the office."

If anything can excuse the refusal of some Protestants to vote for Mr. Smith, it was the expressions of certain official Catholic papers both at home and abroad when the campaign was at its height. Of special interest are the expressions of American Catholic papers. While

most of them were very cautious, limiting themselves to appeals against "bigotry" and denunciations of "intolerance," the October issue of the *Missionary*, the official organ of the Catholic Missionary Union, of which Cardinal Hayes is president, had this statement, which makes very bad reading:—

"This campaign has been intensely significant to Catholics because it is so plainly a part of our divine Lord's own age-long and world-wide campaign. Warfare is being waged in this presidential campaign on the mystical body of Christ, rather than on the man Alfred Emmanuel Smith. Each detail of the current struggle fits into the Gospel-story with astonishing precision. With this in view, is it any wonder that all Catholic lovers of Christ are feverishly praying for Governor Smith's success?"

The October 4 issue of the *Catholic Union and Times*, official paper of the diocese of Buffalo, N. Y., contained this, which was even worse:—

"Were a Catholic elected to-morrow, the drowning man in the person of the Protestant Church would quickly sink from view. The straw at which he has grasped as an anchor would disappear with him. The remnants of Calvinism, Lutheranism, Wesleyan teachings, and Episcopalianism would die, as their sects are disintegrating from division, discord, and dissension."

In view of these statements and in view of the fact that the Popes have never repudiated the idea that civil rulers are subject to the Pope and that the Pope is the supreme judge of civil laws, it certainly remains a duty of all Americans to keep an eye on further efforts of the priesthood to carry out the Roman Catholic program in the United States. Dr. C. R. Tappert, editor of *Lutherischer Herold* accurately describes the situation:—

"Of course, we can expect that the Pope and his hierarchy will not be overhasty in showing their teeth. They will not at once attempt to do in a predominantly Protestant country what they are doing at the present time, for instance, in Spain or in Lithuania. They can be patient and make allowance for the temporal suspension of the actual enforcement of their claims and principles. But they have not renounced a single one of them. They are just biding their time and opportunity. And is it not the duty, and will it not therefore be the aim and constant endeavor of a loyal Catholic, to procure and obtain for the 'Holy Father,' by means fair or foul, those rights and powers which indeed he does not at present enjoy in our country, but which according to his conviction he ought to enjoy in all the world, because they belong to him by divine right? And if he cannot at once accomplish all that is desired, will he not at least try to go as far as he dares?"

Temporal Power At Last.

9. Temporal Power At Last.

At Last! — At last!

The Pope has been recognized a temporal ruler by the agreement between Pope Pius XI and the Italian government, signed February 11, 1929. The treaty and Concordat signed by Premier Mussolini and Cardinal Gasparri settled the sixty year old Roman Question and made Pius XI the acknowledged ruler of the sovereign state newly created, now known as the "City of the Vatican."

The Roman Question — this is the technical term for the problem which was created for the Roman Catholic Church through the loss of her Italian territory in 1870. During the Middle Ages the Pope's claim of being a temporal ruler above all emperors, kings, and princes the world over, was generally recognized. The high-water mark was reached when the Pope drew a line across the Western hemisphere and gave all lands on the west side of the line to Portugal and all lands to the east of this line to Spain. Until 1860 the Bishop of Rome governed a considerable portion of central Italy as a temporal ruler. Italy at that time was a patchwork of nine small states, one among these being a group called the States of the Church. The now reigning House of Italy at that time was sovereign only over the Island of Sardinia and a small portion of Italy. Parts of Italy were ruled by Austria and where she did not rule her supremacy nevertheless was recognized. A desire for national union took strong root among the people, who found a leader in Count Cavour. The first steps towards national unity were accomplished through a war with Austria. However, Count Cavour and his col-

leagues were strongly anti-clerical. Although Catholics they clearly saw that the curse of Italy, the cause of all its disunion, poverty, misery and crime was the Church of Rome as a political organization, and so they at once attacked the Church.

Under the supreme influence of Cavour, the Siccardi laws were passed, which took away all Church privileges. The archbishop and the priests in Turin who opposed its operation were imprisoned and banished — the archbishop was sent across the Alps, where he died in exile. Cavour secularized education; Cavour dissolved the religious orders and confiscated their properties; Cavour made marriage a compulsory civil contract, taking it out of the hands of the Church; Cavour sent an army into Central Italy and took possession of the States of the Church; Cavour made Rome the legal capital of Italy, thus bringing about the fall of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. All this he did in the interests of justice and liberty as a Catholic; and when thus the power of the Church as a "political caucus" was broken, Italy was free to begin her march onward and upward, materially, intellectually, and morally. Therefore Cavour and his colleagues were excommunicated by the Pope, were cursed by the Church — were regarded by the Church as her fiercest enemies. But they were thus able to redeem and regenerate Italy politically.

In 1860 a part of the Papal States by popular vote asked annexation to Sardinia. The task of unification was completed ten years later. The famous patriot Garibaldi played a prominent part in the moves which finally made Italy a nation unified under one head from the Alps to the Strait of Messina. The war which resulted so disastrously to Austria's power was really of her own making. After 1866, and during the year preced-

ing the outbreak of war, Austria was continually doing things, on the borders of Venetia, and in the Trente and Trieste territories, irritating and insulting to Italy. And all this hostility was due to Austria's enslavement to the Papacy. She could not forgive Italy's taking the Papal States from the Church in 1860.

The union of Italy in 1870 eliminated the Pope as a temporal ruler. Strangely enough, the collapse of the Pope's temporal power came immediately after he had wrung the dogma of Infallibility from the Vatican Council. July 13, 1870, the Pope decreed that he was infallible. July 15th, war was declared by Napoleon III, one of the Pope's tools. July 18th, the dogma of papal infallibility was declared. July 25th, the French troops were ordered to withdraw from Rome. Then the Italians rose as one man and declared that the temporal power of the Pope should cease, and Rome should be the capital of united Italy. September 2nd, Napoleon was defeated at Sedan. September 4th, a republic was declared in France. September 12th, the Italian army entered the Papal States. September 20th, Victor Emmanuel entered Rome. October 1st, he was chosen king. Thus it was only fifty-three days from the decree of the dogma of the papal infallibility to the setting up of the republic, and only sixty-nine days to the overthrow of the temporal power of the Pope. No wonder that he died!

The unity of Italy, 1870, was celebrated by the great gathering of famous Americans in the Academy of Music, New York City, January 12, 1871, referred to in our Introduction. At this meeting, Hon. James A. Garfield, afterward President, said: "When I was in Florence, in the stirring days of September, 1867, a prominent Italian citizen said to me, quoting a paragraph of Sis-

mondi's *History of Liberty in Italy*, 'Italy is crushed; but her heart still beats with the love of liberty. She is chained and covered with blood; but she still understands her strength and her future destiny; she is insulted by those to whom she opened the career of all progress; but she feels that she is destined to take the lead again, and Europe will know no rest until the nation which in the Dark Ages lighted the torch of civilization with that of liberty shall herself be able to enjoy the light she created.' 'This,' said the Italian 'was prophecy in 1832, but in 1867 we are witnessing its fulfillment.' Italy can now rejoice that popular suffrage has restored her ancient capital and completed her national unity."

William Lloyd Garrison said: "The evil wrought by that power in the State and the Church, through all the ramifications of society, and in the mental, moral and physical conditions of the accumulated millions subject to its sway through long suffering centuries, has been vast and immeasurable — the overshadowing curse of Christendom. It is for heaven and earth to rejoice over its downfall. Now, where all has been darkness, let there be light; where conscience has been perverted or paralyzed by the sorcery of Papal domination, let it be quickened and have unlimited scope; where reason has been dethroned, let it be inaugurated with more than kingly honors, and let the people of Italy resolve never more to wear the fetters of civil or religious bondage."

To the Pope were left only the Vatican Palace and its gardens. Since that time the Pope called himself "the Prisoner of the Vatican," and never relinquished the hope of again being granted a slice of territory which he might rule as a secular prince, thus being enabled to sit as a temporal ruler in the council of nations. This was called the "Roman Question." It was settled by the signing of

the treaty between Mussolini and the Pope February 11, 1929.

As early as August, 1928, the *Osservatore Romano* (the official paper of the Pope) insisted that "the liberty and independence of the head of the Church must be not only real and perfect, but also manifest to the faithful world." The Pope cannot permit any government to rule over him. As the Vatican organ expressed it, he "cannot depend on, or be under the influence of, any power, however good and Catholic." Then followed an emphatic demand that the crime of 1870 must be corrected, — "that the Pope's temporal power must be restored and Italy, if she wishes to seal relations of friendship with the Vatican, must cede to the Holy See enough territory to form a new papal state." The idea is advanced that "the large tract of land adjoining the St. Peter Basilica and the Apostolic Palace should be ceded by Italy to the Pope." Thus would be fulfilled the demand of the Pope for "some sort of judicial independence, analogous to that enjoyed by every state. The Church should have the essential elements of a state, beginning with territory however tiny." (*Beginning* — note that word.)

The kind of government which this new state of the Pope would exercise is to be gathered from an article in the Pope's organ which appeared in July, 1928. It records with approval a demand for the "suppression" of Protestant newspapers, schools, and clubs," the government being called upon to take some action in view of the fact that, "owing to the great hospitality and civilization of Italians, the Protestants deem themselves free to spread their heresy aiming at the destruction of the spiritual unity of the Italians."

The Treaty and Concordat do not demand the immediate suppression of non-Catholic forms of religion.

They are mainly concerned with matters of real estate and with the laws of governing the relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the Italian State. Analyzing the situation created by the "liberation" of the Pope it is clear that the papacy has contented itself with a rather meager "victory." Remember that up to the year 1870 the Pope controlled, as a temporal ruler, not only the entire city of Rome, but, besides, five thousand square miles of Italian territory, with a population of more than two million. He now receives title to the Vatican palace and gardens, which he always had, one hundred and ten acres of adjacent territory, mostly parks and gardens, and a number of churches and palaces, scattered here and there through the city. It is to be questioned whether the actual ground holdings of the Pope will be worth more in the real estate market than the property to which the Archbishop of Chicago holds title.

The Pope was to receive, according to original reports, about one hundred and ten million dollars by way of indemnity for having been kept a king without a country for sixty years. This amount has now been scaled down to about forty million dollars in cash and about forty-seven million in Italian bonds.

Heresy — by which is meant every religion but the Roman Catholic — is to be suppressed in Italy. This, however, does not mean that Protestants must vacate Italy; they are only to cease their "propaganda."

It is too early to estimate the political effect of the Pope's entrance into the ranks of temporal rulers. Naturally, the nation principally involved is Italy itself. And since the interests of Italy and France in the Near East have caused friction between these two nations ever since the World War, it can be readily seen that since the Pope now recognizes the House of Savoy as the

ruling house of Italy he is already, as far as the Near East is concerned, involved in international politics.

Catholic opinion in France has been "profoundly uneasy" about the agreement, and "more than a little resentful at the omission of the Pope to consult anybody outside the Vatican about a matter involving the future of the whole church. Until a few days before the agreement was signed not even the highest dignitaries of the Catholic Church in France knew that there had been official negotiations between the Vatican and Mussolini and the first reports that an agreement had actually been arrived at were received with incredulity. One of the principal reasons for the incredulity was the well-known opposition of Cardinal Gasparri, the Papal Secretary of State, to any agreement with Fascism, based on his conviction that the Fascist regime could not be permanent. When it became evident that an agreement was in fact imminent Cardinal Dubois, Archbishop of Paris, rushed off to Rome to lay before the Pope the misgivings of French Catholics, but without avail. He did not wait in Rome for the signature of the agreement and nobody has been deceived by the reason officially given for his hurried departure." (Special Correspondence of *Baltimore Sun*, Paris, February 19, printed in the *Sun* of March 12.)

Soon after, one of the high dignitaries of the Pope's court complains about the "impertinent doubts" of certain people as to whether the Pope in his deal with Mussolini had really gained an advantage. The French particularly are referred to. Yet, while these doubts may be "impertinent," for some Catholic churchmen they seem grounded in reason. Not only is the so-called City of the Vatican a fiction, so far as the term "city" is concerned, but the treaty with the Italian State has rather restricted than expanded the immediate influence of the Pope in

temporal affairs. As "Pertinax" said in the *Echo de Paris*, the agreement is in effect a return to the conditions existing until the middle of the eighth century, when the Roman emperor was the protector of the Papacy, with the important difference that, for the Roman Empire which represented the whole of European civilization, is substituted Italy, which is but one nation among many.

The *Baltimore Sun* correspondent, already quoted, said:

"Everybody here recognizes that there is no real restoration of the temporal power, and that the tiny 'Vatican City' is in no real sense a state. Except that the Pope is given absolute property in his own palace and about 110 acres, he gets no more by the political treaty, according to the information published, than was given him by the Law of Guarantees which recognized him as a sovereign, whose person was sacred and inviolable, with the right to send and receive diplomatic envoys, to have his own postal and telegraph services, and so on. By the Law of Guarantees the precincts of the Vatican were immune, and the Italian police and other officials were forbidden to enter them.

"In any case the 'Vatican City' is a strange kind of state, for citizenship will apparently be conferred merely by residence and therefore be temporary. It is already admitted that the citizens, who will consist only of ecclesiastical officials and the employes of the Vatican, will retain their respective nationalities. Theory apart, the Papacy must inevitably become more dependent on Italy. It was the fiction that the Pope was a prisoner in the Vatican and had no relations with the Italian Government that made him independent."

The indemnity of about ninety-five million dollars is a considerable one and must prove a heavy burden on a poor country where the economic and financial conditions are extremely bad. But in the Concordat, the Dictator has saddled an even heavier price upon the people. This Concordat undoubtedly gives the Papacy conditions that no modern state, however Catholic, gives to the church. Napoleon's Concordat put the church to some extent un-

der the control of the state. Mussolini's puts the state under the control of the church. It in effect destroys religious liberty, for the Catholic religion is declared to be "the sole religion of the state," which suggests that other religions will barely be tolerated.

In any case religious liberty is destroyed in the schools, for the teaching of the Catholic religion, according to a program to be agreed on by the Holy See, is to be compulsory in secondary as well as elementary schools, without regard to the religion of the pupils or the wishes of their parents.

The Pope himself has publicly said that this Concordat above all induced him to come to an agreement. As M. Maurice Pernot put it on February 13 in the *Journal des Débats* (Paris), "what the Pope gives he gives in his capacity of head of the universal church; what he receives he receives in his capacity of Bishop of Rome and head of the Italian Church." In other words, he has risked a possible diminution of his international authority to increase his authority in Italy. Whether that was even good politics for the Pope remains to be seen. One thing is evident even to the distant observer:

The church and Fascism in Italy henceforth stand or fall together, for the downfall of Fascism would mean not only the end of the Concordat but probably an anti-Catholic movement the consequences of which cannot be foreseen.

The influence that has triumphed is that of the Jesuits, who have long supported Fascism.

On one point only we entertain no doubts whatsoever. In explaining to the American public the right of the Pope to demand a position of Italy, Catholic journals have made the claim that the Pope "as the head of the universal Church must obviously and naturally be un-

der the dominion of no one nation or no one race; neither should he be, in the perfect fulfilment of his universal office, the subject of emperors, kings, or potentates." (*Catholic Telegraph*); and that for this reason he insists on being recognized as a temporal ruler. Without doubt, this is a very arrogant position for any churchman to take. Why, in all conscience, should not the head of a religious sect be governed by the law of the state in which he lives? Why should the head of a religious body demand "the recognition of him by all governments as having equal sovereign rights with themselves in temporal matters"? (*Sunday Watchman*). Does the Archbishop of Canterbury, head of the Anglican Church, demand that he be given the title of a temporal ruler, and a private militia? Does the President of the Missouri Synod, or of the United Lutheran Church, or of the Swedish Augustana Synod insist upon independence from the authorities of Cook County or Manhattan or Rock Island? Do they expect a railroad station to be assigned to them, a flag and coat of arms (recognized by the United States and all other nations), a private postal service, and a standing army (though it consist, like the Pope's, of only a platoon)? And if this seems absurd, why should the world be expected to accept these claims at face value when they come from the Pope? We consider the principle of "absolute independence of the Holy See" a colossal piece of arrogance, because we do not admit that the Pope is exercising "supreme spiritual power over the Church of Jesus Christ, which by the ordination of Christ Himself must be *as universal as the human race itself*" (*Catholic Telegraph*). If that were true, then, indeed, it were high time for Catholics everywhere to recognize no other government but his. What would then become of the world's peace?

In *Current History* for July, 1929, Attorney Charles C. Marshall discusses the Italian-Vatican Agreement under the heading "A Blow to Religious Freedom." Mr. Marshall points out particularly Article 2 of the treaty, in which Italy expressly reaffirms its recognition of "the sovereignty of the Holy See in the field of international relations as an attribute that pertains to the very nature of the Holy See," and Article 24, in which the Holy See reserves "the right in every case to exercise its moral and spiritual power." Mr. Marshall believes that the guarantee of these claims assumed by the Italian government give just cause for alarm. He writes: "The supremacy of Papal sovereignty, under the sanction of damnation, is an integral part of the faith of Roman Catholics, the supremacy covering matters belonging to morals — education, marriage, family relations, public worship — subjects over which every State also claims jurisdiction. There is thus a conflict of jurisdiction between the Papacy and all political States which has been — and is — one of the chief causes of discord, civic strife, and even of revolution, throughout the world. When, therefore, the Dictator of Italy — the genius of the coming Italian Empire — stands with the Pope in making august guarantees and pronouncements of Papal sovereignty in the field of international relations, the apprehension of all those throughout the world who are not Roman Catholics is instantly and emphatically renewed."

Mr. Marshall, commenting on the supremacy claimed in respect to moral subjects, refers to the statement by Dr. Ryan, (already quoted in our book p. 25), in his book "The State and the Church," "that whether a particular act of the State is contrary to the moral law must be decided by some other authority or tribunal than the State itself," namely by the Catholic church. The closing

paragraph of his article in *Current History* may well serve as the concluding thought of this treatise:

"If religious liberty depends merely on a minority of Roman Catholic votes in the State, and not on the bed-rock of universal human right, then indeed, is the enjoyment by every people, of that liberty, precarious. What has happened in Italy demonstrates that such liberty, to be enduring, must be based on the unchangeable sentiment and conviction of the people, and on their undivided loyalty to the ideal, within the civil State, of equality of right in matters spiritual as well as temporal. When a part of the electorate is under allegiance to a religious sovereignty, extraneous to the State, asserting its claim to their obedience in matters belonging to morals, then is the moral institution of religious liberty menaced and the natural provision of equality of right in human society frustrated. With the growth in any country of a Roman Catholic minority into a majority those inestimable gifts of God may go the grievous way they have now gone in the land of Dante and Cavour."

